DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 176 752 IR 007 706

AUTHOR Rayward, W. Boyd
TITLE The Writing-in-Chicago Program of the Chicago Public Library. An Evaluation.
INSTITUTION Chicago Public Library, Ill.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 90p

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Evaluation; Adult Education Programs; Citizen Participation; *Community Programs; *Creative Writing; *Enrichment Programs; Library Administration; Program Development; *Program Evaluation; Public Libraries; Questionnaires; *Workshops
IDENTIFIERS *Writing in Chicago Program

ABSTRACT

An experimental writing program lasting three years and four months was held in the Chicago Public Library System, for which writers-in-residence, scholars-in- residence, and other program associates presented several series focusing on the city of Chicago. Emphasis during the first year centered on the literary/historical aspect of writing in and about Chicago, and later expanded to include the process of writing in specific genres, as well as the work of special groups. Although differing opinions and emphases on administrative details were evidenced between project and branch staffs, participants in the Writing-in-Chicago Program were very enthusiastic, used the library and cultural center more, and traveled a longer distance to attend sessions than participants in other programs. Concerns of the project director were publicity, whether to give academic credit for courses, and the relationship of his office to the branches; however, the main goal, to provide interested citizens with access to scholars and professional writers in a library atmosphere, was reached. Recommendations were to continue writing workshops and Wild Onion (literary) Festivals, solicit external funding, and create a permanent position of coordinator of library programs. A narrative account of the program, description of academic components, learner questionnaire, interview guides, and relevant correspondence are appended. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED176752

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The Writing-in-Chicago Program of the Chicago Public Library: An Evaluation

by

W. Boyd Rayward

Chicago, 1979

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. Boyd Rayward

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IR007706

SUMMARY

Description.

The Chicago Public Library's Writing-in-Chicago Program had two basic components: an "academic" component in which the history of the subject was considered systematically from a number of different points of view; and a "writing" component in which various kinds of writing workshops and presentations by well known literary figures took place. The program was presented by a Scholar-in-Residence, a Writer-in-Residence and a number of program associates, all prominent literary or academic figures. The program was supported by a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities with in-kind support from the Chicago Public Library. The period of programming was three years and four months and sessions in connection with the program were given in the branches, the Cultural Center and the Woodson Regional Library. In addition to the writing workshops and academic programs were a number of related single events: for example, a screening of films derived from novels set in Chicago or by Chicago authors; tours to certain important landmark areas of the city; and general literary celebrations (The Wild Onion Festivals).

Participants.

Participants tended to be over 21, to have been involved before in adult educational or "enrichment" programming, and to be library users already, though there were more non-users in the writing programs than in academic programs. Participants in the writing programs tended to travel further to programs and to make greater use of the Cultural Center and the temporary Central Library than participants in the academic programs. Participants were enthusiastic about the achievements of the program as far as they were concerned. The only major problems identified were that some series of writing workshops were thought to be crowded and some did not involve enough sessions.

Staff.

Program associates and branch, administrative and program staff all concluded that the Writing-in-Chicago Program was successful. Each group identified certain overlapping problem areas in connection with it: 1) role of the branches; 2) credit; 3) publicity. Major values associated with the program were: 1) its content was related intimately to libraries; 2) it was located in neighborhoods where people lived and worked; 3) it was free.

Issues.

The program raised some important general issues and the library's experience of the program helps to suggest some resolution of them.

1. Does such a program help the library to reach out to non-users, those for whom otherwise it seems not to be providing a service? Participants tended to be users, though the writing component attracted a few non-users. There is no way of assessing if these non-users continued to use the library after the particular part of the program they were enrolled in finished.

2. Does a comprehensive and sustained publicity campaign related to such a relatively dramatic, easily identifiable program stimulate support and use? Most participants indicated that general library publicity or word-of-mouth was the major source of information about the program. Publicity in local neighborhood media was also important. TV and radio and the major daily newspapers played no great role in informing participants about the program. The more general publicity, however, was thought to have increased the library's visibility in the city and to have attracted interesting and useful "friends." Nothing can be said about any implications for active support of the library apart from program participation.

3. Is the availability of college credit or other form of academic recognition for such programs important for participants or "teachers" ? Most participants were not interested in college credit; some of those few that were

Table of Contents

Chapter		Page
Summary		i
I.	The Writing-in-Chicago Program	
	Introduction	1
	The Program	2
	Discussion	5
	Program Elements	7
II.	Participants	
	Introduction	8
	Participant Characteristics	11
	Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction	15
III.	Staff	
	Introduction	19
	Program Staff	20
	Branch Staff	25
	Project Director	29
	The Chicago Public Library Administration	32
IV.	Evaluation	
	Goals	33
	General Observations	34
	The Future	
	Writing Workshops and Writers-in-Residence	37
	Wild Onion Festivals	39
	Coordinated System-wide Programming	40
Appendices		
I.	Narrative Account of Writing-in-Chicago	43
II.	Writing-in-Chicago: Academic Components	56
III.	Writing-in-Chicago: Writing Workshops	60
IV.	Writing-in-Chicago: Single Events	62
V.	Questionnaire	63
VI.	Interview Guides	67
VII.	Interviews and Reports	70
VIII.	Request for a Proposal for Evaluation and Proposal	71

CHAPTER I

THE WRITING-IN-CHICAGO PROGRAM

Introduction

The Chicago Public Library (CPL) has a long history of adult educational programming. Soon after an event that had brought citizens and writers together in the library, a suggestion was made that the library should create a Writer-in-Residence program. In 1974, the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) expressed interest in a proposal submitted to it to obtain funding to support such a program, but suggested that the program be re-designed to express a stronger educational emphasis than it then seemed to have. The first proposal for what was called the Writing-in-Chicago Program was prepared by a team appointed by Deputy Chief Librarian, David Reich. This proposal was revised as a result of review at NEH and two major changes were made. The first was to introduce a Scholar-in-Residence to complement the Writer-in-Residence in recognition of the program's strong academic component. The second was to require the creation of an advisory committee to assist the project director in developing the program and in selecting the writers and scholars to be involved. As well as the Scholar- and Writer-in-Residence, both to be full-time, provision was made for what, after an evolution of terminology, were eventually called program associates who would provide elements of programming part-time. A further revision of the proposal required that membership in the advisory committee rotate, at least five members being replaced each year. Stephen Kochoff was designated program director.

On May 7, 1975, the Chairman of NEH informed now Chief Librarian, David Reich, that NEH would fund the Writing-in-Chicago Program as part of its

Cultural Institutions Program, designating the Chicago Public Library an NEH Learning Library. The Endowment undertook to provide the library with $282,341.86 and the library estimated its in-kind support of the program as $140,690.07. The period of provision of the actual program was to be April, 1975 through August 31, 1978; it was subseqeuntly extended to December 31, 1978.

The major goal and subsidiary objectives of the program as set out in the proposal were:

> To offer the people of the Chicago Metropolitan Area a coherent educational program in the Chicago Public Library in which they might learn about writing in Chicago and attain academic recognition for this learning, where appropriate, through demonstrated accomplishment.
>
> OBJECTIVES:
> 1. To provide programs conducted by practicing writers and other professionals in the fields of writing and literature aimed at increasing public knowledge of writers and their writing habits and their contributions to literature in general; 2. to provide individual guidance for those learners who request such guidance in their studies of writing and literature; 3. to provide opportunities for learners in the program to attain recognition of academic competence and acceptance (credit, advanced placement, etc.) through demonstrated accomplishment via cooperating institutions of higher education; 4. to provide access to scholars and professional writers to interested citizens and groups of citizens; 5. to provide a working/research environment for Scholars-in-Residence and Writers-in-Residence and to assist them in their endeavors; 6. to examine the effectiveness of such a model program in the public library; 7. to disseminate information to the entire public library field and to the field of higher education in this new role of public service.

The Program

After a five month planning period, the Writing-in-Chicago Program was inaugurated by Dr. Kenny Jackson Williams, Professor of English at Northeastern Illinois University as the Scholar-in-Residence. During this period, two program associates, Ms. Joan Kalk and Dr. George Christakes, both from the Chicago City Colleges, gave a fourteen session series in the Blackstone and Rogers Park Branches of the library respectively. Williams's program was called,

"A New City Makes its Debut" and both program associates participated in it. Kalk's series was called: "The Mind of the City: Aesthetic Interpretations," and Christakes's, "The Mind of the City: Intellectual Interpretations." Dr. Williams conducted a tour of Chicago's historic Graceland Cemetery, and a film was shown about the cemetery and its residents: "Giants and the Common Man." Thus, the program began by stressing matters of an essentially academic kind.

The first period of the program was a difficult one administratively. Eventually four crucial questions defined themselves and had to be resolved: 1) what was the proper administrative relationship between the project director and upper level library staff on the one hand and the "academic staff" on the other? 2) what were the respective responsibilities of the two groups for program elaboration and direction? 3) what was the nature of the program and the audience to which it was intended to appeal? and 4) what was the exact role and function of the advisory committee? The "academic staff" considered the program and library staff insensitive to the needs of scholarship. Dr. Williams developed a number of personal grievances. The project staff and the advisory committee thought the program was too academic, the format of most programs (lectures) inappropriate, and the "academic staff" insensitive to the needs of the library and its community. Moreover, the project staff and the advisory committee experienced certain problems related to the behavior and views of Dr. Williams. On January 16, 1976 Dr. Williams resigned and it was decided to complete the first program year without a Scholar-in-Residence. The number of program associates for the second segment of the program year was increased from two to three.

The Writing-in-Chicago Program got into its swing in the second segment, which began in February 1976, of the first program year. Dr. John Lark Bryant

from the University of Chicago in a series of programs examined humor in Chicago for the period 1890 to 1930. Dr. John Ferguson, also from the University of Chicago, examined the concept of the city in the realistic movement in American writing from 1890 to 1920. His program was followed by one by Dr. Bernard F. Rodgers, Jr. from the City Colleges of Chicago on Chicago in the twenties. In June and August William Adelson from the University of Illinois at Chicago Circle conducted a tour of places of interest in the history of the labor movement in Chicago. The first program year concluded with a general literary festival called "The Wild Onion Festival."

In the second year both a Writer and a Scholar-in-Residence were appointed. The latter, Michael Kathman offered a series of programs in various locations throughout the city. A number of program associates offered other "academic" programs. Harry Mark Petrakis, a noted Chicago novelist, conducted a series of Writing Workshops in the Cultural Center and in the branches. He offered two Advanced Writing Workshops as well. In addition to these systematic series of meetings, he made single appearances called "Meet the Author" in sixteen branches throughout the system. Another kind of writing workshop was conducted at Woodson Regional Library and the Whitney Young Branch by Henry Blakely: "You Can Write Poetry ...." The program year concluded with a second literary festival, "Wild Onion Festival II."

In the third program year, which was extended through December 1978, although no Scholar-in-Residence was appointed, a number of program associates continued the "academic" investigations begun earlier in the program. Harry Mark Petrakis continued as Writer-in-Residence and gave a very intensive series of writing workshops. He also gave a version of his "Meet the Author" presentations directed at young people at seven branches. Program associates gave writing

workshops on fiction, poetry, drama, theater criticism, and "feature writing." A special occasion was the Peggy McPhaul Writing Awards which were presented in association with the Writing-in-Chicago Program. In addition to these programs were two series of film screenings: one involved showing two different film versions of four novels; the other presented two screenings of each of seven films based on novels. In both cases the novels or novelists were connected with Chicago.

A full narrative account of the Writing-in-Chicago Program is provided in Appendix I. Appendixes II through IV present the various kinds of programs in tabular form with locations, dates and average attendance.

Discussion

The preceeding narrative account permits a view of certain evolutionary characteristics of the Writing-in-Chicago program. The first program year, with its awkward start, was essentially "academic" and historical in its orientation to Chicago writing. In the second year a balance between the academic and "writing" components was struck in the persons of and programs offered by the Scholar- and the Writer-in-Residence. It also became clear in the second year that the program could attract and sustain the support of relatively high-powered associates, a phenomenon even more apparent in the extended third year of the program. The academic component took on an interesting complexity: the study, as it were, of the literary history of the city, the study of the history of the city as reflected in its literature and the study of the city as an environment in which authors lived and worked. Moreover, the study of the development of writing in Chicago itself broadened and deepened as the program extended to include the writing of special groups (such as Blacks) and "genres" such as journalism and drama.

The third program year suggested a shift in emphasis between the academic and "writing" components. Petrakis's writing workshops were intensified and were supplemented first by more general workshops related to the techniques of poetry and

of fiction and second by special kinds of writing workshops such as those devoted to feature writing and theater criticism. In a sense these amplifications paralleled the academic component of the program. This, devoted to the history and present status of writing in Chicago, also continued in the third program year and continued to be characterized by that complexity of approach previously identified.

Moreover, each year provided one or more major events related to the Writing-in-Chicago Program's main theme: here the visit to Graceland cemetery and the film about the cemetery should be noted, together with the labor tours of the city and above all, the film versions of novels by Chicago area writers. Again, that programmatic complexity which I have mentioned, that distributes emphasis between the history of the city and the history of the literature, is evident.

The program on the whole displays what seems to be an increasing confidence as more people are distributed throughout more of the library system doing a greater variety of things. It is also clear that certain major programming locations became evident: an area centered principally on the Edgewater Branch and its neighboring branches in the library's Northeast District; the Cultural Center in its key downtown position and, perhaps to a lesser extent, the Woodson Regional Library, situated more or less in the middle of the combined area of the Southeast and Southwest districts. There seemed to be, moreover, along with variety a certain stability in programming, represented by Petrakis's two year term in the program, Kathman's one year and by Rodger's frequent and systematic participation which made him almost de facto Scholar-in-Residence. One point, and it is a small one, should perhaps be made about the program's overall stability and coherence as represented in its personnel. The orchestration, so to speak, of the program's personnel led to the geographical separation of related programs. Thus Rodgers's program, "The Renaissance in Retrospect," was given at the Cultural Center, and his "Since the Renaissance" at the Edgewater Branch. His Contemporaries I, II and III were offered at different (though nearby) locations. Few programs, however, were designed to build on each other in this intimate, sequential way, and most, as a result, were "portable" and were given in several locations. This

was a particularly pronounced feature of the second program year with its resident, full-time author and scholar who served in a wide variety of locations throughout the library system, offering the same program at different times during the same program period.

Program Elements

It is possible from the foregoing descriptions and discussions to identify certain program elements that can be considered separately or together in any assessment of the program's future.

A) Lecture/discussions of an "academic" nature related to

1) The history of writing in Chicago by genre

a) Fiction

b) Poetry

c) Journalism

d) Drama

e) Criticism

or by ethnic or racial group

f) Black writing

2) The history of Chicago as a literary environment

a) Ethnic competition

b) Politics

c) Architecture

B) Writing workshops by genre

1) Fiction

2) Poetry

3) Journalism

4) Drama

5) Criticism

or of a practical nature

6) For publication

C) General literary festivals

D) Tours of Chicago monuments and neighborhoods related to important events or aspects of Chicago literary and general history

E) Film programs - translations of books to film (with author's commentary)

F) Single appearances in branches of a notable figure in Chicago literary life

G) Systematic, system-wide programming (co-ordination irrespective of content)

CHAPTER II

PARTICIPANTS

Introduction

When planning the program, the Writing-in-Chicago staff sought advice as to how it might be continuously evaluated. In consultation with the Office for Research of the American Library Association, the staff drew up a questionnaire (revised and simplified after the first few program series) that was distributed to participants toward the end of each program series. (A copy of the questionnaire constitutes Appendix V of this report.) The staff also asked program associates to count the number of participants in each session of a series, or themselves did this. According to the Program Director, these figures were carefully and systematically collected. Similar counts were made for the events that constituted the Wild Onion Festivals,

sometimes a count being several times duplicated by staff and security guards. As a result, a body of statistics as to participation in and participant response to the Writing-in-Chicago program is available.

The gross figures of attendance are clearly accurate and the figures for average attendance at a particular program series are nearly always used in the tables that appear in this section of the report and as a basis for discussion. An average allows us to ignore fluctuations in attendance that may have occurred because of adventitious external circumstances: weather, sports events, special television programs, community events, and so on. It also allows us to ignore fluctuations that may have occurred as participants dropped in and out of a program as it progressed. However, such averages hide the fortunes of a series over time: systematic increases or decreases in attendance attributable to the degree of success of a particular program in a particular location. One may assume that any major problems associated with individual programs will be revealed by interviews with or reports from program personnel, and no attempt has been made to use attendance figures for this purpose.

Far more serious in interpreting the available statistics is the fact that participant response based on returned questionnaires is bound to be biased. The questionnaires were distributed at one meeting towards the end of a series of meetings and were returned by a proportion of those in attendance at this one meeting. Except for chance cases, the respondents to the questionnaire may be assumed to be those who lasted the course and completed the questionnaire because they had strong positive views about the programs of which they were part. Those who may have had strong negative views, because of the duration of most series would be more likely to have dropped out than to have persisted to the point when the questionnaire was administered. No attempt was made by program staff to identify those who, for whatever reason (especially those who

had dropped out of a program), were not present on this occasion; nor did they attempt to discover why those who were in attendance but who did not complete the questionnaire failed to do so. For obvious reasons, this would have been difficult if not impossible to do. Thus, there is now little opportunity of ascertaining the scope and content of potentially strong negative responses to particular programs. That is to say, we can say nothing about non-responding participants or, of course, non-participants.

The questionnaires, then, allow a crude picture to emerge of respondents and of their reactions to particular programs. Because of the way in which the questionnaire was designed, it is impossible to be precise -- or sometimes to say anything at all -- about a number of potentially interesting phenomena: age (other than over or under 21), sex, educational background, or frequency of participation in a particular program or in the Writing-in-Chicago program more generally.

These caveats stated, one may examine the data presented in the tables which follow. Though the respondents to the questionnaire are a highly self-selected group, some generalizations about them are possible. Indeed, it could be argued that, in some ways, as program stalwarts, respondents constitute the group most worthy of analysis. On the other hand, while we cannot here say anything about non-responding participants or non-participants, the latter may be a group no less interesting to study than respondents.

Questionnaires from an arbitrary selection of programs were analyzed. An attempt was made to ensure that responses to a variety of programs in a variety of locations were obtained. No questionnaires were obtained for individual sessions, such as Petrakis's "Meet the Author" programs or the film series or the tours. Moreover, questionnaires from the last writing and "academic" programs are not available, nor are the statistics for attendance

were not interested in the agency from which the library had secured some recognition for the program. Program associates, "the teachers," tended to be unenthusiastic about credit, seeing the value of the program as different from that of formal academic programs for which credit could be sought.

Recommendations.

1. The writing component of the program should be retained and modified to allow the library to appoint a Cultural Programs Fellow or Humanist-in-Residence from any area of the arts and humanities relevant to the library.

2. Such a position should be supported by external funding for which it could well be a magnet in that the position would probably be unique in the city, could be clearly and specifically distinguished from the library's routine or "greyer" activities, and association with it could be made to appear highly "glamourous" and desirable.

3. Annual Wild Onion Festivals should be continued.

4. A position of Coordinator of Library Programs should be created to collaborate with the branches, the Cultural Center and the Central Library and other city agencies in developing programs and finding outside funding and other forms of support for them. This is the single most important recommendation of this report (see pp. 40-42).

5. The position of Coordinator of Library Programs should be located in the library's administrative hierarchy at the same level as other coordinator positions.

6. The Coordinator of Library Programs should be provided with an appropriate budget and other forms of organizational support to develop centrally programs that will both complement and supplement those which will continue to be developed in the branches and in the Cultural Center.

Table II

General Characteristics of Respondents

	Full/ Part-time Enrollments	Previous Enrichment Courses	Use of Central Library (425 N. Michigan)	Use of Cultural Center	Use of Branches
Academic Programs	.21	.68	.15	.38	.83
Writing Programs	.21	.64	.26	.40	.61

There was very little difference in the general characteristics of those who participated in the writing and the academic segments of the Writing-in-Chicago Program. Not shown in Table II is the number of those under 21. There were a total of seven in the whole sample of respondents in the writing programs under 21 years of age and a total of two in the sample of respondents in the academic programs (five did not give this information in the first case and one in the second). Thus respondents were almost always over 21, and as Table II shows, only about a fifth of them were engaged in formal education, either full or part-time. About three fifths of both "academic" and writing program groups, however, had had some previous experience of extension or enrichment courses.

Neither group tended to make much use of the temporary Central Library at 425 North Michigan, or the Cultural Center, though the "writing" group tended to use the temporary Central Library rather more. While both groups used the branches much more heavily than they did these central facilities, the academic group's branch use was notably higher than that of the writing group. The differences between the two groups' use of the Central Library and of the branches is statistically significant at the .05 level; that is, the difference is unlikely to have occurred by chance.

for these programs. They are not counted in the tables that follow: that is, the academic programs are considered to have been 38 in number and the writing programs 33.

Participant Characteristics

Table I

Respondents

	Total No. of Participants	Respondents in Sample	Participants in Sample	Respondents in Sample / Total Participants	Respondents in Sample / Participants in Sample
38 Academic Programs	934	228	359	.24	.70
33 Writing Programs	702	134	189	.19	.63

Table I shows that there were 934 participants in the "academic" programs and 702 in the writing programs over the whole course of the Writing-in-Chicago project. These totals are derived from the average attendance at each program series involved. Seventeen "academic" programs were chosen for analysis and 10 writing programs. Table I shows that this involved 228 respondents to the questionnaire in the "academic" segment of the program and 134 in the writing segment, or about a quarter of the total participants in the former or about a fifth of the participants in the latter. A total of 70 percent of those in attendance at the "academic" programs analyzed responded to the questionnaire compared with 63 percent of those in the writing programs analyzed.

Table III

Frequency of Library Use

	Once Every Two Weeks	Once a Month	Less than Once a Month
Academic Programs	.75	.89	.10
Writing Programs	.61	.77	.17

It is clear from Table III that those in the writing programs tended to be less frequent library users than those in the academic programs. (The difference between the two groups in terms of use every two weeks or more or at least once a month is statistically significant at the .05 level.)

Table IV

Travel to Program Site

	Resident Outside Chicago	Own or Neighborhood Branch	Travel Two or More Miles	Not Determinable
Academic Programs	.07	.64	.18	.09
Writing Programs	.19	.30	.39	.10

Some attempt was made to determine the location of the site in relation to the respondents' residence. The figures shown in Table IV are particularly tentative because the questionnaire asked only the name of the location or neighborhood of residence and which branches were used, and a respondent's use of particular branches would depend exactly where in a particular neighborhood he or she lived or worked (problems posed by use of branches near

where one worked are not considered). Table IV represents an attempt to determine where respondents lived in relation to the branch which was the site of the program they were attending. Some differences between the writing and the "academic" groups are apparent. A slightly higher proportion of out of Chicago residents were attracted to the writing programs than to the "academic" programs. Those who attended "academic" programs tended to do so in their own or a neighboring branch whereas many fewer of those participating in the writing programs tended to be doing so in their own or a neighboring branch. Supporting this observation is the fact that a considerably higher proportion of participants in the writing program tended to be willing to travel more than two miles to these programs than in the academic programs. (These differences are statistically significant at the .05 level.)

How did respondents learn about the particular program they were attending? Table V shows that about two thirds of the "writing" group and three quarters of the "academic" group learned of them from posters displayed in library facilities, by mailings from the program headquarters or from the branches, or simply by word of mouth. Radio and TV were mentioned very seldom as sources of information about the program. Slightly more of the writing group than the academic group indicated that they had seen a newspaper story or advertisement but these differences are not statistically significant (that is, the differences between the two groups could have occurred by chance). It should be noted that a number of respondents heard about a particular program from several different sources which they indicated on the questionnaire.

Table V

Publicity

	Newspaper Story or Ad	Radio or TV	Posters, Other Library Sources and Word of Mouth
Academic Program	.21	.04	.74
Writing Program	.29	.03	.66

Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction

A number of questions on the questionnaire were directed at determining how satisfied or dissatisfied respondents were with a program series and why. Some attempt was made to tabulate these responses to determine how frequently the content of a program, the instructor personally, the group process and intangible personal benefits (such as "inspiration," for example) were mentioned as causes of satisfaction or dissatisfaction. It became evident that both groups were remarkably similar except that there were more occasions of enthusiastic outpourings in the academic group than the writing group, and that this latter group's criticisms, when it had them, were mostly related to lack of time for the program. No tabulations of responses is given in that the problems of interpretation of categories and the lack of real differences seem not to warrant any extended discussion.

It is clear from the point of view of all respondents, that the programs were enormously successful. In the writing programs, the availability of a prominent author was the strongest source of satisfaction. Frequently respondents cited the inspiration of the situation for them, frequently they cited

the opportunity to see how a creative person ("a great author," "a professional writer," someone "successful in the field") functioned. Less frequently mentioned were specific benefits related to actual work. Some, however, cited such sources of satisfaction as "correction," "good advice on writing and narration," and "I've learned how to edit my work." A sufficient number mentioned the value of the program in reassuring them that they were not struggling alone to make this noteworthy, along with the fact that they were stimulated or motivated to write more or to begin to write again through group participation and the inspirational example provided by the instructor.

Some typical comments: The most satisfactory aspect of the program was "the opportunity to get to know the author and sharing of his life, writing and techniques ..."; "I don't feel like a freak because I like to write"; "help with my own poems"; "association with like-minded people"; "exchange of ideas with others"; "opinions and experiences of a successful writer"; "Exploring my own talents and learning"; "Hearing Alan Gross's misadventures with his own play"; "some concrete help"; "The program offered me the opportunity to meet a professional critic ... and it helped me to gain experience in writing criticism."

The "academic" group had similar comments. They were stimulated by the instructors who elicited various kinds and degrees of praise. They found the groups congenial and provocative. They gained insight, knowledge, confidence, refreshment of memory. Here are some typical comments: The most rewarding aspect of the program was: "a good teacher who stimulates you to read and think for yourself"; "very thorough presentation"; "splendid leader-instructor willing to have - indeed welcoming and stimulating - strong participation"; "the discussions"; "exposed to a range of writings one might not otherwise discover"; "You see and meet different people of the area and learn about topics that interest you"; "real interest and knowledge of other class members increased

my interest to read more"; "informality of sessions, lack of pressure, openness to group, interested people"; "highly enriching, informative, stimulating"; "gaining insights and knowledge about authors"; "our teacher made everything so interesting"; "the program helped me grow professionally, intellectually, thus giving me another perspective on life." One respondent simply exclaimed, "All tops!" another, "It's all super"; another, "I have enjoyed every aspect"; another, "I have so enjoyed the broadening aspects."

Dissatisfaction was clearly very low. Frequently no criticisms of a program were advanced. Where criticisms occurred, and their volume was greatest (though not of any appreciable magnitude) in the writing group, they dealt with such matters as a group being too large in size for much personal attention, or they expressed a sense of a need for more time. Some respondents complained that they did not get corrected manuscripts back quickly enough, or that they had to travel to get to the program location. Typical comments are: The greatest source of dissatisfaction was "the fact that it [the program] has ended"; "insufficient time"; "too short"; "lack of personal involvement possible with the number of people included"; "too far away"; "teacher had not enough time to do what he had told us was his plan at the beginning"; "not enough individual attention"; "I wish there were more sessions. I wanted it to go on longer ..."; "too short - sad it's over." In both there were occasional asperities such as: A major sour-- of dissatisfaction was "the time taken up by silly questions"; "the lack of a foundation by other students on which to have meaningful discussions"; "the other students weren't stimulating."

As to the appropriateness of the program to the Chicago Public Library there was no doubt. Only one respondent to the appropriate question thought the program he or she had attended should not have been at the Library, and he

or she indicated that what was most damaging about the program was "its ever-present sexual obscenities.... It is detrimental. Following the destruction of value can never build anything valuable (sic)." (This was Petrakis's writing workshop at Lincoln Park which elicited an extraordinary volume of positive comment and negative comment only about size of class and shortness of duration.) A number of respondents were attracted to the program because it was free and because it was relatively close to them ("in the neighborhood"). Some quite revealing comments about the Library and the program were made: "The Library is taking the place of the old town hall"; "Glad to see the Library becoming a civic center"; "the library should be more than just a place to get books, Mr. Kochoff"; "the library should be a center of writing and reading. The program should be expanded. There is no reason why this cannot be the center for writing in the country"; "What better setting for writers than the place where people go to read."

If these kinds of comments are typical of the views of all participants, and there is no reason to suppose they are not, then the Writing-in-Chicago program presented participants with opportunities for learning, for personal growth, for interaction with others that were highly valued, despite classes being sometimes too few, or sometimes too large in size or too far away or in which one was forbidden to smoke. All respondents (bar one who seemed from the nature of his or her responses to the questionnaire to be eccentric to say the least) thought the programs were appropriate to the Library and one respondent wrote at the end of the questionnaire's "thank you" "No, thank you."

CHAPTER III

STAFF

Introduction

As part of the evaluation of the Writing-in-Chicago program, the experiences with and opinions about the program of the project staff, the branch staff, and the central administrative staff of the Chicago Public Library were sought. Interviews were held with five upper level administrators of the library, with six branch heads (some of whom had experiences of the program in several different locations), and with the project director and two of the program associates (interview schedules are given in Appendix VI). Written reports were prepared by six other program associates and the Scholar-in-Residence at the conclusion of their period with the program (those interviewed and those who provided reports are listed in Appendix VII). No attempt was made to seek interviews from all project staff or heads of all of the branches in which programs were held. The selection of branch personnel was not entirely arbitrary, however, in that an attempt was made to include those connected with the most frequently used program sites. The reports available from and interviews conducted with project staff suggested a sufficient commonality of experience and opinion as not to warrent further interviews. The central administrative staff were all in a position to identify major problems in the project and to indicate policy alternatives now under consideration and potentially relevant to the evaluation. One problem should be noted in this last case: only one of the central administrative staff interviewed has had a connection (and this changed in nature) with the program over the period of its entire life. Staff movement at this level has been relatively frequent in the last three or four years, and no attempt has been made to interview those no longer in the library's employ. It should also be noted that a number of interviews were sought but not held. No more than two

attempts resulting in contact with the persons involved were made to set up interviews.

Although most library and project staff interviewed thought it unnecessary, it was stated that the content of the various interviews would be anonymous. It was thought that a promise of anonymity would encourage those able to make possibly critical observations to offer them freely. As it turned out, little that was strongly critical of personnel and programs emerged. Nevertheless, the observations which follow observe the promise of anonymity. The content of individual written reports submitted by project staff, however, are not in any particular way confidential; their availability is presumably governed by whatever rules of access to the Library's archives are in force.

Program Staff

Most of the program staff indicated that the program was a success from the point of view of their own goals for it. On the writing side they were able to meet a few students of seemingly outstanding promise, contact with whom they found particularly stimulating. Indeed, two of the program associates devoted most of their reports to a discussion of the work of individual students. One, "thanked all concerned for an enjoyable experience" and another was "pleased and excited by the responses of the learners."

On the academic side was the stimulation of "these people in Chicago ... receptive, inquisitive and appreciative." Two program associates used these same epithets in the same order in slightly different contexts to describe participants. Another spoke of the pleasure of providing "a meaningful forum and [responding] to a real need in a particular reading group"; another of the unique teaching experience; yet another found the sessions at Edgewater, where

participants tended to be older, provided an opportunity "to test theories about the twenties - by critics like Frederick Hoffman - against the realities my students had experienced." After a subsequent series that this associate also conducted, he observed that the occasion had "provided me with an opportunity to investigate more thoroughly the writing done in Chicago since World War II and, in the process, provided the inspiration for a book on contemporary Chicago fiction ...."

Most of the associates were clear that the program was appropriate in a library. They tended to agree as to why - an environment of books, open to the public, in a neighborhood and free. Some thought that the library environment was better than a more formal educational setting which "frightens people off." Moreover in a neighborhood one gets a different range of people involved than in a college. One spoke of the different ages, backgrounds, and understandings of participants, unlike a college in which students tend to belong to the same peer group. Though this disparateness made the formation of a cohesive group difficult, an increased richness in the teaching and learning experience occurred when a proper group interaction was achieved. Most associates worked closely with individual participants, regularly setting aside time before or after a formal session for this purpose.

Because of the library setting, however, most program associates were not enthusiastic about providing academic credit for the courses. As one said, "I don't believe the program can honestly offer the kind of attention that 'college credit' implies. Furthermore, I don't think the program needs college credit to entice learners to participate." It was observed that if the programs were offered for credit, the "instructor might have to teach as though he were at

a college" and that "The college has no idea of how valuable the material discussed will be to my course of study. There are no tests, outside reading, no papers, none of the discipline that is the heart of education." In fact in the language of a third, "they are two different breeds of cat. The library program should be informal and designed for those who can't go to college." Only one associate thought college credit a good idea in that it might give students "more incentive ... the teachers would have to do more work ... it would sharpen up the students, attendance, etc." Several associates indicated that the issue of college credit tended to be academic in any case in that most students did not want it, and there was little response to the matter from the City Colleges of Chicago. Some learners on their own initiative sought for and obtained credit towards degrees they were already working on from local colleges for participation in the program.

The program associates were uniform in their belief that the program was efficiently and sensitively administered. One observed that he was given great flexibility in conducting his part of the program but was always aware of support and advice being available. He expressed gratitude at being kept free of "reams of paper work." "The fact that everything worked as well as it did is due totally to Mr. Kochoff." A word that was used frequently in describing the administration of the program was "flexible " - flexible in moving a program that was floundering at one branch to another, in leadership, in making changes "designed to improve the series." Kochoff's attitude was described as "cooperative" and "experimental and professional." One called him "terrific" in an interview. The written reports of the program associates were addressed to the program director and one assumes this fact would lead to a certain delicacy in what was said of the program's administration. On the other hand, the reports were made at the end of

a series, and all associates were sufficiently independent and facile with words to make their opinions known. That is to say, it seems clear that those program associates from whom reports are available or who were interviewed had no quarrel with the way in which the program was run and many of them were strongly positive in their assessments of its administration.

It is clear from the views of the program associates that no less important to their sense of an effective program than the central administrative office was the cooperation of branch libraries. A positive statement of this was: "strong and competent branch library support is the single most important ingredient to a successful program. I firmly believe that my sessions had a chance to be successful because of the overall excellence of the Edgewater Library Program under Miss Dolores M. Kane." This associate identified interest in the program by the branch head, a courteous and helpful staff, and a strong overall library program providing access to a participant pool as the ingredients of successful branch cooperation. In the words of another associate, "Miss Kane has developed her community," and her branch is one "where people are used to coming and participating." Several associates pointed up the differences between the Cultural Center and the branches. There were cookies and juice at Lakeview. The opposite was true at the Cultural Center where some participants were turned away by guards "who told them there was no such program in the building." "Down town was very impersonal (the security guards didn't have the doors unlocked; there were no facilities for coffee)." There was some criticism of the branches that despite "the coffee and cookies at break," because the sessions continued up to closing time," we were hustled by janitors and staff members. It is kind of detracting when people come in and start switching off the light panel in mid-sentence." Another, having found at the series at Edgewater, partly because of

the staff, "an absolutely extraordinary experience for all concerned," had the impression that at Lincoln Park, "the library staff felt we were an unwanted burden" and they turned out the lights and stood at the door in coats urging people to leave.

Perhaps the single greatest concern expressed by the program associates was publicity. There was some sense that in the early stages of the program, at least, the "word" did not get out easily enough or was disseminated widely enough. In these stages of the program such problems were probably inevitable. Nevertheless, such comments as the following suggest an important area of concern: "The program staff was helpful to me but I was concerned about how well the staff got the word out to the general public about the existence of the program"; "General publicity is necessary - particularly in the form of newspaper advertising. However, publicity on the local branch level is even more crucial." The importance of the branch in public relations was shown. "I think more time and money should be spent working with branch staff members, prior to the beginning date of each session. Perhaps giving them a packet of materials - press releases, posters, etc. with display and distribution instructions might be effective." Program success," said another, "related directly to branch effort - those that wanted the program to be held, did their own publicity, and did not rely solely on the central efforts of the Writing-in-Chicago Program." The problems involved in publicity and branch participation are discussed in the next chapter, "Evaluation."

Associates also indicated that they occasionally experienced what one might call "mechanical" difficulties such as were created by insufficient headquarters staff, lack of branch support in supplying required materials, getting sessions taped or equipment set up. These seem to have been of no great magnitude, and were sufficiently infrequent in occurrence to suggest they reside in the general category of inevitable problems that arise in getting things done through and by

people; that is to say, they did not seem to indicate any general organizational or administrative difficulty in the program.

Branch Staff

The branch heads consulted for the purpose of evaluating the Writing-in-Chicago Program all considered it to have been successful. They tended to regard the value of the project, however, as lying not so much in stimulating library use as in promoting the library's visibility in the community and in providing participants, who were generally recognized as library users anyway, with a chance for close involvement with books and writing. It seems clear that there was general recognition of the dual aspects of the program (what I have called the writing and the academic aspects) though one branch head was unable to describe the program in terms of objectives or purposes in any general way.

There were differences of shades of perception by different branch heads about the program and library use. Several thought the program may have brought in a few non-users to the library; one thought that it stimulated users who had not been in the library for a long time to come to see what was happening. Another remarked that the program had brought more people from outside the city of Chicago than was usual; usually suburban libraries attracted Chicagoans because they could provide "similar programs" more often and better. The reversal of this trend was seen as suggesting the Writing-in-Chicago's strength. A shrewd remark was that while the program tended to bring in little or now "new business," the library should not see this as indicating failure. "It's what patrons get from the program that's important" and the library's gain in terms of use and support should be considered from the long-term point of view of good will engendered.

A number of opinions were expressed as to why the Writing-in-Chicago Program was particularly valuable to the library and distinctive among other kinds of library programs. It brought books and people together. It focused on "developing the craft of writing" and letting learners "get close to people they ordinarily couldn't." "It really belonged in the library." Other library programming - dog training, beer can collecting, macramé were mentioned by several branch heads - was not specifically related to the library and could just as well be carried on somewhere else. But Writing-in-Chicago was a distinctively library program, could not readily be done in the same way elsewhere, and was available to everyone quite free. One branch head described one occasion as typifying for her all that was best with programs for the library. She had gone to the Austin Branch to a session in which Gwendolyn Brooks, the noted Black Chicago poet, had appeared. The branch, "doesn't have heavy circulation and its difficult to attract people there," but on this occasion 200 people appeared. The program "fitted in really well, and boy, did we get a crowd! It was heart-warming - and she was so kind. She read some of the people's poems. It was the most memorable event in a library I've seen. A special audience, practically all black. Just a wonderful sight to see." She went on to say, "The community keeps asking when are we going to have something like this again."

Another factor was also stressed. Not only was the program relevant, it was of high quality professionally and involved the branch in little effort or expense. "All we had to do was fix the coffee"; it cost the library nothing but the facility." One branch head remarked that though they have painting and flower demonstrations and a class on photography, "we don't have academic programs discussing serious issues in a systematic way." With such a program the branch

can supply this want; again, "the only thing we have to worry about is fixing coffee and cookies."

Most branch heads would like the program continued in some form, but there was a general sense that if it were continued its value to the branches would lie, in single notable occassions (such as Gwendolyn Brook's appearance) or in a lengthy session held once a year so that other kinds of programming for other audiences could still be provided. As one branch head observed: with a serious program like this coming along once a year, "we can talk it up" as something special. Such a program should not be given "along the lakefront" more than once "because of the mobility of the population." The problem is "coordinating this with other kinds of programs"; there are so many other activities going on competing with the library," referred to here was a vital series of programs carried out in the local schools of a particular community, and direct conflict with them was seen as undesirable. Programs requiring regular attendance would not attract so many people as a "one-shot spectacular." A reflection of this point of view were comments such as these: "This is not a program for everybody or for every branch. It depends if the community is there or not"; "the great mass of the population is not interested in this kind of thing, but for the more literary and scholarly it provides a better image for the library and helps it compete better with other institutions." Nevertheless one branch head remarked: "From out point of view we would like to have something of this kind continuously. If I would have another program of the same caliber, I would take it in a minute and could get an audience."

It is interesting to see some of the problems experienced in the branches by program associates from the branch point of view. One commented on "small, petty problems" created by the demands of some instructors for setting up a room.

Another, describing the instructor as "terrific," emphasized how frequently the participants commented on "how helpful and interested the instructors were;" she went on to say that the participants themselves were so enthusiastic that the branch staff "had to push people out of the building." In another branch, the instructor kept the staff "a little late" without letting them know ahead of time. This librarian pointed out that at issue here was not being kept late but problems of the security of the one person who might be left behind to shut up an empty building. Had some warning been given, arrangements for someone to stay behind could certainly have been made. One branch head said that she provided coffee and cookies out of her own pocket. Another pointed out that at the end of many hot days her staff did not fix coffee and the instructor "was very cross."

The branch heads all thought the program well run. One said that she "couldn't think of any branch that has anything but good things to say about Steve Kochoff and his staff." Another said, "Steve was wonderful; we never had any problems with anyone in his office." Nevertheless some difficulties were reported: "downtown was cooperative, at least verbally, but things were not always carried out." This librarian referred to promises from the program's central office to take care of advertising through local media, "but it didn't." She observed that if she had done it herself, "it would have worked." Her reservations, in essence, concerned the centralization of the program especially in advertising and scheduling. The central office could not consult easily with the community about the latter problem and "ignoring people from the community is foolish and not good for community relations."

This same librarian pointed out yet another problem: the discontent of those excluded from a writing program. This, interestingly, took two forms.

The first occurred when an instructor let too many people into the class, so that local people felt they were getting short shrift because of the presence of too many participants not from the neighborhood. The second occurred when potential participants were excluded by means of the admissions requirements from a writing program. In one branch where a lot of applicants were not accepted into the writing program, there were some professional writers among those rejected. They were "disgruntled" and "are still talking about it."

Project Director

It seems appropriate to discuss the experiences of the project director at this point in that when interviewed he directed his comments towards three major areas: publicity, credit for courses and the relationship of his office and the branches.

In each of the first two years of the program a professional public relations firm was retained to provide a sustained, systematic publicity campaign for the program: Marketing Communicators for the first program year, Precise Communications, Inc. for the second. Regular reports of their work were provided to the project director by each of these firms. They undertook the distribution of news releases and made a range of different kinds of contacts with the media through which news items and so on were placed. No public relations firm was retained in the third year. The project director expressed reservations about the effectiveness of these externally managed publicity campaigns. He now believes that the public relations consultants were not really needed, that there was already sufficient public relations expertise on the library staff, and that the program director himself can do a great deal by virtue of his position to maintain and develop contacts with the media. Moreover, the program had

gradually developed a good mailing list which represented a substantial following for the program, and was able to rely on in-house publicity, though the latter was sometimes difficult because the Writing-in-Chicago Program was not necessarily a priority within the library.

At the same time as the project office worked with the public relations consultants, it tried to stimulate branch support in obtaining useful local publicity for the program. Posters, brochures, and handouts were sent regularly to the branches. The program director attended district meetings (the library is divided into four districts for administrative purposes) and sent out memoranda to keep the branches informed of program developments. Branch staffs were asked to supply the central office with mailing lists of individuals and organizations used by them in their programming. The director's conclusion was that the program was not always "pushed" as much at the local level as he had hoped.

A systematic attempt was made during the second program year to introduce branch staffs to the Writer and the Scholar-in-Residence. Working by districts, the director took each to various branches and introduced him to the staff. The idea was that when a branch was consulted as to whether it would like a program, the staff would know who and what was involved. This was a way also of giving the Scholar and Writer a "feel" for the library's diverse communities. On the whole the director reported that branch staff were extremely cooperative and interested. Occassionally there was some opposition from the branch staff over promotion of the program in a particular branch. Sometimes, the branch staff indicated that the program wouldn't work there. Once or twice the program director met with open animosity.

Credit had been a problem of the program from the start. Early in the

program's history, contact had been made with Lincoln Open University, but this was broken after the University was involved in a scandal in 1975. The National Endowment for the Humanities had been enthusiastic about the program earning academic credit for participants. To this end, negotiations were conducted with the City Colleges of Chicago which agreed to recognize the program and procedures for obtaining credit were worked out. These were never satisfactory and were changed from time to time. The director reports that maintaining liason with the City Colleges proved to be very difficult. As it turned out very few participants were interested in credit, and over the whole period of the program according to the director's estimate only about 20 persons sought and obtained it.

At the beginning of the program, the director reported that the then Chief Librarian had indicated that the library needed to recognize that there were three kinds of learners: "first, the casual and irregular; second, the motivated and regular with no interest in credit; and third, wanting credit." It was his view that library programs attracted the first two types and not the third. This seems to have been the case in practice, though lack of enthusiasm for credit by program associates may have discouraged some participants from seeking it.

From the director's point of view, the major success of the program was the writing segment and the types of writer attracted to teach in it. "The writing aspects were wonderful. People meeting in a sympathetic, free environment, free of charge, with some of the most well known and best writers in Chicago." The academic component was more problematic in that so much of its success depended on the personalities of the instructors. It contained none of the glamour inherent in the writing aspects of the program. There was some question in the director's mind as to how well the two aspects of the program were or could be integrated.

Major problems identified by him were publicity in the branches and inconsistent branch cooperation. More general was the program's sometimes "not being understood" in terms of what it tried to achieve. This may have been a consequence of ill-defined goals or a consequence of a complex but limited program in a large organization where communication is necessarily difficult.

The Chicago Public Library Administration

The views of the administrative staff of the library are, of all those sought, perhaps the most important because this staff is in a position to comprehend the program as it were completely in the round. Their remarks were on the whole general and as much directed to the future as to the past.

There was general agreement that the Writing-in-Chicago program was an interesting experiment. It was a "cultural undertaking of value and appropriate to the library." It was innovative, attracted good media coverage, and produced interesting "friends" for the library. It was unusual in the library for the length of its support. Nevertheless such a program was regarded as not being a very high priority among other programs. The highest priority for the library remains "the traditional one of providing educational resources to the community." It was inevitable that the cessation of outside funding for the program would cause problems, for it was clear that as developed the program could not be supported from the regular library budget; it was simply too costly.

Nevertheless, a composite opinion seems to be that the success of the program indicated a need for some focus on literature to be maintained in general library programming in the future. The Wild Onion Festivals as general celebrations of literature and the humanities were considered effective in themselves and as attracting positive publicity for the library. Whatever aspects

of the program were to be retained and developed, it was generally thought that formal educational linkages for them were not of paramount importance.

As far as the history of the program went, some problems in the relationship between the program office and the branches were identified. Rather than being designed in close collaboration or consultation with particular branches, sometimes programs were seen as "being laid on the branches from outside and then picked up and carried away and they [the branch staff] don't feel involved." One view had it that communication with the branches was not as good as it could have been.

CHAPTER IV

EVALUATION

Goals

It is clear that the Writing-in-Chicago Program was an outstanding achievement. Participants, program associates, project staff and administrative staff in the library all agreed on this. It is equally clear that the program met the goals and objectives set for it in the program proposal in so far as these were actually realizable. It is not clear that information, for example, about "the new role of public service" has been or will be disseminated "to the entire public library field" or how this could ever be known. Nor is it clear how effectively the program provided "a working/research environment for Scholars-in-Residence and Writers-in-Residence," though one program associate was stimulated to plan a new book. Nevertheless, programs "conducted by practicing writers and other professionals in the fields of writing and literature" were conducted; participants were provided with individual guidance when they required it; some attempt was made to provide opportunities for academic credit; and ultimately, interested groups of citizens were provided with access to scholars and professional writers. Moreover, the program seems appropriate to the Chicago Public Library in terms of

the spirit of its revised five-year plan, though this seems not to make explicit provision for such programming.[1]

As an experiment, the Writing-in-Chicago program was a notable success and what is now required is to decide what can be learned from it. What did it demonstrate? Are there aspects of it that can be incorporated into the library permanently? Under what circumstances might this be possible?

General Observations

Certain general observations can be made as a result of the library's experience of Writing-in-Chicago. First, what was unique about the program were the writing workshops. These had some - but no very great - power to draw non-users to the library. Whether or not those participants who were previously non-users continued to use the library is not known. There seems to be no reason to suppose that they did, given the special nature of the program. A more interesting observation is that participants in the program tended very strongly to be library users already. This had significance for publicity and program location.

The most effective forms of publicity originated from within the library. Posters, word-of-mouth, and handouts of various kinds in the branches were of most importance, together with mailings from program headquarters. These mailings were cumulations of lists supplied by the branches, and, as time went on, of the names of participants in previous Writing-in-Chicago programs. Notably ineffective were radio and TV spots. Newspaper advertisements and stories had some effect in attracting program participants, and the project director indicated that neighborhood newspapers were more effective than the major city dailies for this

---

1 *Planning for Service. The Five-Year Plan of the Chicago Public Library/Chicago Library System 1978-1982*. Chicago: The Chicago Public Library/Chicago Library System, 1978.

purpose. As users, prospective participants presumably noticed and responded to library-based publicity more than publicity which had to compete for attention with the mass of information emanating from the media. That some kind of selective attention was at work seems plausible: neighborhood sources for neighborhood activities, the library for users. While general publicity is desirable its news function is probably different from that intended to attract program participants.

That participants showed a strong neighborhood orientation to the program is clear. The more unusual "writing" aspects of the program, it is true, attracted more people from further away than the more conventional "academic" programs. Even so, most programs at particular branches tended to be dominated by neighborhood people. Sometimes, as in the Northeast district of the library the neighborhood may be considered to have flexible boundaries, and participants proved willing to move fairly readily from branch to branch, especially to those relatively close to the Edgewater branch.

In certain areas, such as Edgewater and some of its neighboring branches, fairly long programs of high quality and seriousness were popular, and elicited a large and enthusiastic following. In some cases the natural order of events in which a dropping off of membership in a program group seems inevitable was reversed and programs became more popular as they went along. The existence of these fertile programming areas is something that should be noted by the library for further development.

Though few neighborhoods are as responsive to library programming as Edgewater and some of its nearby branches, some showed themselves to be very interested in single events involving the appearance of well-known, charismatic individuals like Petrakis and Gwendolyn Brooks. Thus, in some areas rather long,

systematic programs requiring continuous group participation and support will "go"; in others where these sorts of programs are not usually successful, people are willing to participate in a single, well-publicized, extraordinary event.

It is important not to see the former as "good" and the latter as "not so good." The single events, of which it should be remembered the most complex and sustained were the Wild Onion Festivals, have a dramatic, popular quality that may be as important for the library in their stimulation of a wide if transient interest and active if brief participation in its work, than longer programs which attract a small band of devoted followers. The two kinds of program meet different needs, have different effects, and should be seen as complementary.

Another observation is that academic credit seems not to be an issue in this kind of library programming. Not many participants sought it, and of those who did, a proportion on their own initiative arranged for it with academic institutions other than the City Colleges of Chicago with which the staff of the Writing-in-Chicago had made contact for this purpose. One suspects that credit is sought for library programs by the library, or is seen as desirable for them by a funding agency such as the National Endowment for the Humanities, as a way of validating the quality of the program, of establishing their educational value "objectively." Responses of project staff and of participants suggest that such programs as Writing-in-Chicago have their own virtue and desirability and that these are independent of the requirements of other agencies. Of course, the library should be flexible in responding to any expressed need for academic credit for appropriate programs it offers, but it seems best for it to plan the most effective kinds of programs it can in light of the requirements and needs of the members of its diverse communities and to allow credit or other academic recognition to be a secondary consideration, exploration of which can occur at the

initiative of individual participants. Such remarks should not be considered as having any implications for programs such as Study Unlimited mounted in active collaboration with educational agencies.

The Future

Writing Workshops and Writers-in-Residence.

As this evaluation has stressed, the most distinctive feature of the Writing-in-Chicago Program has been the writing workshops. These were provided systematically throughout the library by the Writer-in-Residence. The use of program associates allowed for variety in kinds of writing studied. The Writer-in-Residence, in addition to his workshops made highly successful individual appearances in a number of branches. It seems to me that either or both components could be continued by the library. That is, it could organize in the Cultural Center, in the new Central Library when it is completed, and in the branches various kinds of writing workshops either on a systematic or an ad hoc basis. It could also attempt to appoint a Writer-in-Residence at some time in the future. This seems to me the more desirable alternative if a choice has to be made, as one supposes it must, given the fiscal and administrative constraints within which the library must operate. The single, prominent individual can give workshops, make appearances in branches, and engage in other kinds of activity as thought advantageous.

The major problem is, of course, now that outside funding is ended, one of cost. This is not insurmountable. The glamour and the highly visible local character of the Writer-in-Residence seems to me to make the position a logical one for developing outside funding support. It is unlikely that the library could or should attempt to support such a position out of current operating

funds. The position, however, is sufficiently distinctive in the library - and in the city - to prove attractive to one or more funding agencies within Chicago. This kind of sponsorship already occurs in the library - the Dame Myra Hess concerts, for example, sponsored by Talman Federal Savings and Loan Corporation. It might also be possible to seek permanent endowment funding as opposed to simple sponsorship.

Moreover, the name of the position might be changed and its responsibilities broadened. While the written word is clearly a major concern of libraries, the records of other cultural activities are also important to it. Thus, in a search for outside funding it might be desirable to allow the position to grow and to be called "The John Doe III Memorial Cultural Programs Fellow or Humanist-in-Residence of the Chicago Public Library," and appointments to it could be made from any of the fields of the arts and humanities: music, theater, journalism, letters and also appropriate academic fields. That is, in such a position could be conjoined the Writing-in-Chicago's Writer- and Scholar-in-Residence.

What could be envisaged is a prominent individual appointed each year to the position. He or she might be required to make two major addresses in the Cultural Center of the Central Library, to make single appearances at, say, four branches, and to offer two extended series of workshops in locations to be decided. The appearances could be spread out over a year: that is, residence could be interpreted broadly.

Moreover, funding could be simple or complex depending on the necessities of the case. Simple if one major agency or person could be brought to sponsor or endow the position; complex if funding from a variety of private, corporate and governmental sources is required. The administration of the position would

depend on the nature of support. Presumably an advisory committee would need to be formed to assist in the selection of the individual to be appointed to the position.

In the context of outside support for a cultural or humanities program, it should be noted that the Chicago Public Library is not heavily endowed. A program of the kind suggested here could help focus the attention of potential funding sources on the library. The program, unique in the city, could become a symbol of the library's committment to Chicago's cultural and humanistic activities, of which many take place within it regularly anyway. The program could be a high spot on which to crystallize attention that is otherwise dissipated in day-to-day activities in a multitude of locations. It could provide a unified theme for some of these activities in the branches, the Cultural Center and the Central Library.

Wild Onion Festivals.

The Wild Onion Festivals were successful and there is no reason why they cannot be continued as a regular part of the library's programming. They require no great committment of institutional resources other than a small staff to organize them, facilities, and public relations materials and activities. Should a permanent program, as described above, involving the appointment of a Fellow or Humanist-or Artist-in-Residence become possible, the Wild Onion Festival could be linked to this. In any case it seems particularly appropriate that the library provide the opportunity for a general celebration of the arts and humanities. The success of the celebrations already mounted suggests that they be continued.

Coordinated System-wide Programming.

Less obvious lessons than the value of writing workshops in the library or the popularity of celebrations of the arts and humanities, are to be learned from the Writing-in-Chicago program. So far matters related to the content of the program have been discussed as opposed to the program's administrative organization. Turning to the latter, I am persuaded that the program has demonstrated the potential value of coordinated programming throughout the library system. I avoid the word centralization in order to stress the importance of programming at the local branch level. Not only is this necessary, it cannot be done effectively other than at the branch level where there exists the most intimate knowledge of the local community. But it is not necessary that all branch programming be local, though inevitably most will and should be. Branches have little or no resources to develop locally high quality, perhaps expensive programs of the Writing-in-Chicago kind. Some branches have indicated their sense of the importance of these kinds of programs being brought to them from the center. In practice the existence of the centrally organized Writing-in-Chicago program did not interfere in any notable way with other branch programming. It provided branches with an apportunity to add a new dimension to their programming otherwise not available to them. Financed and organized centrally and then distributed to the branches, such programs achieve economies of scale, can emphasize matters of importance and interest to the whole of the library's multi-faceted community and conceivably can bring it into close cooperation with other centrally placed cultural and educational agencies, none of which is possible at the local level.

Coordination is the key concept and central to the concept is collaboration. The branches must not feel inhibited in continuing to provide their own programming.

To be effective locally, centrally developed programs need considerable input from the branches both as to general content and as to a form that will "go." Avoided at all costs must be any sense of the center laying on and taking away programs on its own initiative.

What is desirable is a kind of distributed initiative within a general framework. Branches should be able to make suggestions about central programs, participate in their planning and organization, achieve local modifications, and organize local publicity as necessary. The central coordinating function would involve finding and developing collaboratively ideas for programs, identifying appropriate personnel, organizing general publicity and acting as a central liason for branch, program and administrative staff. Such a coordinating function is very similar to those now carried out with respect to the selection of materials and the development of collections for children, youth and adults. Thus it makes sense to consider locating a program coordinator at the same administrative or hierarchical level as the other coordinators. Given the sensitive interactions between the coordinator and the branch staff, potential external support agencies, possible program "stars," and the library's central administrative staff, the occupant of such a position should be a diplomatist able to make independent decisions and be seen to have authority and status in the organization.

It is equally necessary, if a program coordinator is to be appointed that the position have a budget to develop programs. Envisaged here are programs of a sophisticated, non-voluntary, possibly expensive nature. The library must be prepared to pay for quality in program personnel, and to assume considerable organizational costs.

These observations lead one to return to the earlier recommendation that outside funding be developed for a Cultural Programs Fellow or Humanist-in-Residence.

A Program Coordinator could play a central role in finding and coordinating support for this position, in organizing advisory committee meetings, planning programs and so on. Other kinds of programming would also be possible and support for them outside the library would also be necessary. In addition, the coordinator's office, skills, influence and help should be available to branches in developing their own programs. It may well be that "zone" programs may be developed with assistance from the coordinator such as a series of coordinated programs at Edgewater, Lake View, Lincoln Park and Rogers Park branches. Certain branch programs may be identified by the coordinator as likely to be successful elsewhere; certain programs may be studied in a particular branch as an experiment before a decision is taken as to feasibility, appropriateness or popularity in other localities. The existence of an effective coordinator of programs will make a wide range of forms of collaborative programming in the Central Library, the Cultural Center and in the branches feasible.

It seems to me that the Writing-in-Chicago Program has shown the value of 1) a prominent literary or other artistic figure associated intimately in a variety of ways with the library; 2) a general annual arts and humanities festival in the library; and 3) system wide coordination of programming. It is now up to the library, if it is to seek permanent gain or benefit from the NEH funds made available to it, to try to incorporate these elements into its structure.

APPENDIX I - NARRATIVE ACCOUNT OF WRITING-IN-CHICAGO

Planning Period

April, 1975 to August 31, 1975 was devoted to planning. The project director and the chief librarian met with the advisory committee four times during this period. Dr. Kenny Jackson Williams, professor of English at Northeastern Illinois University was appointed Scholar-in-Residence, and was instrumental in the appointment of two program associates, Dr. George Christakes, a teacher in the Kennedy-King College of the City Colleges of Chicago and Ms. Joan Kalk, a teacher on the Southwest Campus (now Daley College) of the City Colleges of Chicago. An advertising firm was retained to ensure a sustained, professional publicity campaign for the program. The first program segment, "Chicago and its literature in Retrospect" was redefined and developed during the period.

1st Program Year

The Writing-in-Chicago Program was inaugurated by Dr. Williams on September 16, 1975 with the first of a series of sessions at the Chicago Public Library Cultural Center. The series was intended to give "a literary and historical account of the development of Chicago from its inception as an 'idea' in the minds of French explorers up to the time of the World's Columbian Exhibition." Both Dr. Christakes and Ms. Kalk participated in this series which was given the title, "A New City Makes its Debut."

Each of the program associates presented a series of 14 lectures in a

CPL branch during this first stage of the program. Dr. Christakes lectured in the Rogers Park Branch on "The Mind of the City: Intellectual Interpretations." Ms. Kalk's series was "The Mind of the City: Aesthetic Interpretations" and was given in the Blackstone Branch. Both series covered a period ending with the World's Columbian Exhibition.

Other program activities were a tour conducted by Dr. Williams of Chicago's historic Graceland Cemetery, and a showing of the film, "Giants and the Common Man" which was about the cemetery and the famous dead interred therein.

The first period of the program was a difficult one administratively. Eventually four crucial questions defined themselves and had to be resolved: 1) what was the proper administrative relationship between the project director and upper level library staff on the one hand and the "academic staff" on the other? 2) what were the respective responsibilities of the two groups for program elaboration and direction? 3) what was the nature of the program and the audience to which it was intended to appeal? and 4) what was the exact role and function of the advisory committee? The "academic staff" considered the program and library staff insensitive to the needs of scholarship. Dr. Williams developed a number of personal grievances. The project staff and the advisory committee thought the program was too academic, the format of most programs (lectures) inappropriate, and the "academic staff" insensitive to the needs of the library and its community. Moreover, the project staff and the advisory committee experienced certain problems related to the behavior and views of Dr. Williams. On January 16, 1976 Dr. Williams resigned and it was decided to

complete the first program year without a Scholar-in-Residence. The number of program associates for the second segment of the program year was increased from two to three.

The second segment of the first program year, February to May 1976, extended through the 1920s and 1930s the examination that had been begun in the program's first stage. Dr. John Lark Bryant, Graphics Assistant at the University of Chicago Press and Advisor in the University of Chicago College, offered a series of 14 sessions on "Chicago 1890-1930: The Comic Scene." The series consisted of both lectures and discussion groups and examined "the unique place Chicago humor holds in America's comic tradition. Writers and illustrators, newspapers and comic magazines, drama and films make up 'the comic scene.'" Begun at the Scottsdale Branch, the venue of the series was changed to the Lake View Branch because of poor attendance.

During this same period, Dr. Robert A. Ferguson, Assistant Professor of English at the University of Chicago, gave a series of 15 sessions at the Edgewater Branch entitled, "In Search of Chicago: Literary Uses of the Urban Experience at the Turn of the Century." He examined "the crucial importance of the city as a concept to the realist movement of American writing from 1890 to 1920," and saw in Chicago "a symbol and context for the artist who sought to describe a rapidly changing America." Many of the participants in these sessions were elderly, and Dr. Ferguson attempted to relate discussions to their lives and experiences. So popular was the series that

participants asked that it be extended into the summer, and from June 12 to August 7, Dr. Bernard F. Rodgers, Jr., from the City of Chicago Colleges conducted a series of 8 sessions on "Chicago and the Twenties." The number of participants increased from an average of 30 in the first series to 50 in the next, and there was considerable lively interaction between teacher and students.

Paralleling the earlier tour of Graceland Cemetery was a Labor History and Ethnic Working Class Tour of Chicago. This was conducted by William Adelman, Associate Professor of Labor in the University of Illinois at Chicago Circle. The tour was given first on June 19 and proved so popular it was repeated on August 21.

The first program year of Writing-in-Chicago concluded with a literary festival that was intended also to introduce the second program year. The Wild Onion Festival I consisted of three days of continuous programming, September 9-11, from 11:00 a.m. through the late afternoon and early evening in the CPL Cultural Center. There were brief lectures by Harry Mark Petrakis, Michael Kathman, and Dr. George Kent, Professor of English at the University of Chicago, who were to be responsible for major program elements in the second year. There were dramatic performances, and performances from dance, folk-song and mime groups. By way of formally introducing Writing-in-Chicago's second year to the press and public, a buffet breakfast was organized for August 17. New program personnel were introduced and activities planned for the coming year described.

2nd Program Year

In the summer of 1976 a number of important appointments were made. New members were selected for the Advisory Committee; Michael Kathman, Director of the Alcuin Library, St. Johns University became Scholar-in-Residence; Harry Mark Petrakis, noted Chicago novelist, became Writer-in-Residence; and a number of program associates were selected. The theme of the second program year was "Literary Perspectives on the Urban Experience in Chicago."

Michael Kathman offered a 14 session program at the Jefferson Park Branch from September through December called "Working in Chicago." This examined "the working conditions that led to the growth of the American labor movement" by means of "a close reading of selected historical works." During the same period he offered a 12 session program at the Edgewater Branch called "Growing Up in Chicago," which, through the novels of the period explored "the cultural and social diversities of Chicago during the first half of the 20th century." He offered an 8 session combination of these called "Growing Up and Working in Chicago," January through March, 1977 in the Chicago Lawn Branch, March through May in the Northtown and the Edgebrook branches and July through August in the South Chicago Branch and in the Cultural Center. Only three sessions of this program were held during the last period because, for personal reasons, Mr. Kathman had to leave the program prematurely to return to Minnesota.

As well as this series, Mr. Kathman offered another in 11 parts called "Chicago, the City of Architecture." This was given first, September through December 1976, at the Walker Branch and was intended "to bring alive the ideas and egos of the great architects of the late 19th and early 20th centuries." Reduced to eight sessions the series was repeated January through March 1977 in the Lake View Branch and March through April in the Cultural Center.

Mr. Rathman began the series at the Roden Branch in June but was forced to terminate it after a few sessions.

During this second program year, Mr. Rathman gave two one session programs called "The Spirit of Chicago." These were to provide "an inter-disciplinary look at Chicago's past," and one took place at the West Belmont Branch, December 2, 1976, the other at the Lake View Branch, December 9. Mr. Rathman returned to the West Belmont Branch and developed the idea behind the programs into an 8 part series which he offered January through March 1977. "The history, architecture and literature of Chicago from around 1880" was discussed from the point of view of "the interrelationships of different ethnic groups, jobs and events . . . ."

Harry Mark Petrakis' contribution to the Writing-in-Chicago program during the second program year was essentially of two kinds. First, he made single "Meet the Author" appearances at 16 branches scattered throughout the city to present "lecture-discussion-question-and-answer sessions" to draw together interested readers "to allow them to satisfy their curiosity about a professional writer's work habits, discipline, craftsmanship." He expanded the program to three sessions which was called "Exploring the Writer's World" in a seventeenth location, the Scottsdale Branch. Second, he conducted writing workshops.

Unlike other parts of the Writing-in-Chicago program, the writing workshops were limited to about fifteen participants who were chosen by an admissions committee after they had submitted a letter of application together with a 2,000 to 2,500 word MS,either a portion of a short story or a chapter of a novel. The workshops were designed "to help writers with specific problems" rather than "any broad concern with theories of literature and style." Each workshop consisted of a number of sessions varying between 5 and 8. In the last quarter of 1976 (the first part of the second program

year), Mr. Petrakis gave the first workshops at the Lincoln Park and Portage-Cragin Branches. In 1977 these workshops were given almost continuously in the Cultural Center, in January through February, March-April, May-June and June-July. As well they were given in the following branches: the King Branch, January-February, the Roden Branch, March-April, the Chicago Lawn Branch, May-June. Moreover, Mr. Petrakis during this second program year offered 2 Advanced Writing Workshops in the Cultural Center. Participants were selected by Mr. Petrakis, and the workshops were intended to allow 15 persons of "talent and demonstrated capacity to write" to interact closely with Mr. Petrakis and their colleagues "on the drafts of revisions needed to produce manuscripts of professional quality." The first Advanced Writing Workshop was held in 4 sessions in March, the second in 9 sessions June-July.

Program associate, Henry Blakely, gave two programs called "You Can Write Poetry . . . ." These, too, were limited to 15 participants and the first series was given at the Woodson Regional Library from January through March, and the second at the Whitney Young Branch, March through May. These programs allowed participants "to examine some traditional poetry to help . . . improve [their] technical competence."

An interesting variation of Mr. Petrakis' single appearances at a variety of branches was a program at the Edgewater Branch, April through May, called "Looking at Writing in Chicago." This consisted of six sessions at each one of which a prominent figure from the Chicago literary community was present "to give a very personal view of the background, trends, styles, successes and failures that make Chicago one of the most exciting and diverse literary centers in the country." The visitors were: Robert Cromie, John Powers, Barbara Schaaf, Herman Kogan, William Brashler and Paul Carrol, the last four of whom were to offer programs in the third year of the Writing-in-

Chicago project.

Two program associates amplified the more academic side of Writing-in-Chicago so vigorously developed by Mr. Kathman in this program year. Dr. George Kent, Professor of English in the University of Chicago, discussed "The Rise of Chicago Black Writing" in a 14 session program at the Woodson Regional Library in the last quarter of 1976. Kennan Heise from the Chicago Tribune gave an 8 session program from January to March 1977 at the Edgewater Branch entitled "A History of Chicago Journalism." This series was designed "to uncover the various historical movements of Chicago journalism as well as investigate the many colorful personalities involved with journalism in Chicago." This program was repeated at the Rogers Park Branch, March through May.

During the summer at the Edgewater Branch, Dr. Bernard F. Rodgers from the City Colleges of Chicago rejoined the Writing-in-Chicago program for an 8 session series entitled "Contemporaries I." This was the first of three series intended "to explore the literary trends since the late 40's as they have been reflected in our city's authors." This program marked the transition to the programming of the third year of Writing-in-Chicago.

The program year concluded with the Wild Onion Festival II which was held at the Cultural Center from Monday, September 15 through Saturday, September 17. Like the first Wild Onion Festival programming was continuous throughout the day with lectures, musical performances, poetry readings, an appearance of the well-known improvisational theater or review group, Second City, with their program "The Best of Second City" and other events. The festival was preceded by a breakfast buffet to which the press and others were invited to meet new personnel and to be given an introduction to program plans for Writing-in-Chicago's third year.

3rd Program Year

The third program year, which was extended from September until December, 1978 repeated and developed the pattern of the previous year. Harry Mark Petrakis continued as Writer-in-Residence. No Scholar-in-Residence was appointed. This was part of the overall program design: a scholar-in-residence for the first year, both a scholar and a writer-in-residence in the second year, and a writer-in-residence in the third year. Program associates provided both the academic component of the program and a variety of writing workshops.

Petrakis gave his "Meet the Author" talks at three branches in the September-October 1977 period, and a version of these directed at young people at seven other branches in June 1978. The three session expansion of these called "Exploring the Writer's World" was given at the Toman Branch in October, at the Mount Greenwood Branch in November and at the South Shore Branch in December, 1977. Writing Workshops were scheduled at the Rogers Park Branch, September-October and at the Scottsdale Branch and the Cultural Center, November-December 1977. In 1978 a very intensive schedule of writing workshops was introduced at the Cultural Center: Tuesday evenings and Saturday mornings, February-April; twice on Saturdays, April-June; again Tuesday evenings and Saturday mornings June-July; and twice on Saturdays, October-November. One Advanced Writing Workshop was held in the third year of the program, September-April.

In 1978, Henry Blakely gave his poetry workshop at the King Branch, February-April, and at the Austin Branch, April-June. The noted poet Gwendolyn Brooks, Blakely's wife, attended one of the sessions officially at this latter branch (she had been at other sessions informally) and drew a large audience.

On May 11, 1978, the Peggy McPhaul Memorial Writing Awards Ceremony was held in the Cultural Center in association with the Writing-in-Chicago program.

The recipient of the principal award was determined independently of the program, but other awards were made specifically in connection with it. Two participants in the Writing Workshops and five in the Poetry Workshops received certificates and cash awards for the excellence of their work in these workshops.

During the year increased diversity was introduced into the writing component of the program. A general poetry workshop was offered in the extended part of the program year by Paul Carrol, a faculty member at the University of Illinois at Chicago Circle and poet. This was given at the Rogers Park Branch and participation in it was unrestricted. It was intended for "beginning as well as more advanced writers." All participants were asked to bring a poem to the first meeting and the workshops proceeded by focussing on "a critical discussion of members' work and participants [were] encouraged to read their poems aloud." Another general writing workshop was held at Woodson Regional Library, September-November 1978 by Leon Forrest, a faculty member at Northwestern University and well known black novelist, "to help each participant with his or her creative writing problems and to point out the techniques significant writers have employed to handle the problems of creating good fiction." Participation was restricted and admission was based on the evaluation of a written submission. Forrest met regularly by appointment with participants in the hours preceding the formal group sessions to offer individual guidance and advice. In the same period but at the Lincoln Park Branch, William Brashler, journalist and novelist, offered an 8 session workshop called "Writing and Publishing." This was open to all, though it, like the other writing workshops, involved intensive work with the manuscripts of participants. The workshop dealt "with the basic ingredients of fiction and non-fiction, and with the world of publishing." The underlying idea was to concentrate on "basic writing techniques ... with an eye toward integrating them into readable,

marketable works." During this program period, workshops were also offered in other kinds of writing than fiction and poetry. In the summer of 1978, Alan Gross, noted Chicago playwright, offered an 8-session playwriting workshop at the Lake View Branch. The purpose of the workshops was to bring "Chicago playwrights together, [let] them talk about their difficulties, try out pieces, read a scene or two." Participants, as in most of the other writing workshops, were required to submit an appropriate piece of work as a basis for selection for membership in the workshop. In this same period, Lester A. Weinrott, journalist, feature writer and advertising man, offered an 8-session series called "You, too, can Write Features." This was "devoted to writing feature stories for newspapers and magazines." Those interested were required to submit a short feature in order to be selected. The series was given twice: June-August, and September-October, both times in the Cultural Center.

At the very end of the extended program year, September-December, Linda Winer, theater and dance critic for the Chicago Tribune, offered an 8-session workshop on writing drama criticism. This was called "... But I Know What I Like" and took place at the Cultural Center. It was devoted to "the theory and practice of theater criticism" and entry to the workshops was restricted, choice of participants being based on a sample of criticism. Participants were required to attend a number of theatrical events and to write reviews of them. The workshop was an outgrowth of an 8-session series at the Cultural Center that Winer had offered earlier in the year called "Chicago Becomes a Theater Center." This reviewed the history of theater in Chicago and then focussed on recent developments. Each series involved "Discussion, occasional trips to plays and some review writing."

The academic program extended the explorations begun in the previous year. Bernard Rodgers, Jr., completed his "Contemporaries" by giving the

second series at the Northtown Branch, September-November and the third series, November-December at the Lincoln Park Branch. He also gave an 8-session kaleidoscopic examination in the Cultural Center in September-October 1978 of writing in Chicago. The series, "The Renaissance in Retrospect: 1890-1930" gave participants an opportunity to discuss "specific works of Chicago authors of the period, their gathering places, their little magazines, their times, and their city." The content of this program was further developed, November-December, in the Edgewater Branch in a series, "Since the Renaissance: Writing in Chicago, 1930-1978."

Linda Winer's examination of theater in Chicago has been mentioned. The program was offered first in the Cultural Center in February-April and again April-June, in the Edgewater Branch. The sessions were intended to allow participants "to try to understand who and what moves the Chicago Theater Movement." The History of Journalism begun in the second program year by Kenan Heise, was further developed by Gary Cummings, of Channel TTW T.V., who gave a series entitled "The Electronic Age: The Growth of Broadcast Journalism." The program examined the effect on the viewer, and on other forms of communication, of "the speed-up of information" involved in television journalism. "Is television taking the place of the written word?" was the underlying question. The program was given at the Lake View Branch, September-November and then at the Cultural Center, November-December 1977.

Two programs in the final program year were devoted in a general way to the environment within which writing in Chicago takes place. The first, given by Barbara Schaaf, author of Mr. Dooley's Chicago, was called "Chicago, the Melting Pot Continues to Bubble." The sessions examined "who came to Chicago, why they left home, when they settled here and what became of them after they afrived." The contributions to Chicago life of ethnic organizations were explored in terms of the press, the labor movement, politics and the arts. The program

Appendix II

The Writing-in-Chicago Program

Academic Components

No.	Location	Lecturer/Leader	Date	Title	Average Attendance
1.	Cultural Center	Keney Jackson Williams	Sept. 16-Dec. 30, 1975	A New City Makes its Debut	56
2.	Rogers Park	George Christakes	Sept. 27-Dec. 27	The Mind of the City: Intellectual Interpretations	15
3.	Blackstone	Joan Kalk	Sept. 27-Dec. 27	The Mind of the City: Aesthetic Interpretations	8
4.	Lake View	John Lark Bryant	Feb. 11-May 26, 1976	Chicago 1890-1930: The Comic Scene	19
5.	Edgewater	Robert A. Ferguson	Feb. 14-May 29	In Search of Chicago: Liberary Uses of the Urban Experience at the Turn of the Century	30
6.	Edgewater	Bernard F. Rodgers, Jr.	June 12-Aug. 7	Chicago in the Twenties	52
7.	Jefferson Park	Michael Kathman	Sept. 13-Dec. 20	Working in Chicago	8
8.	Walker	Michael Kathman	Sept. 14-Dec. 21	Chicago, City of Architecture	22
9.	Woodson	George E. Kent	Sept. 15-Nov. 3	The Rise of Chicago Black Writing	13
10.	Edgewater	Michael Kathman	Sept. 18-Dec. 18	Growing Up in Chicago	44
11.	Chicago Lawn	Michael Kathman	Jan. 18-March 8, 1977	Growing Up and Working in Chicago	15

was offered first, September-November, at the New City Branch, and November-December 1977, at the Edgewater Branch. At the end of the extended program year, Milton Rakove, political analyst on the faculty at the University of Illinois at Chicago Circle offered a program which examined the "dynamics of politics in Chicago" called "Politics Chicago Style." It was given at the Edgewater Branch in September-November, 1978 and in the Cultural Center, November-December, 1978.

In addition to the discussion groups devoted to aspects of Chicago writing were two interesting series of film screenings at the Cultural Center during the first quarter of 1978. The first, given in February and called "Chicago Fiction: From Writer to Reel" presented two film versions of four novels by writers from the Chicago area. The second, "The Chicago Connection" was held in March-April and presented two film screenings of each of seven novels. William Brashler spoke following the second screening of the film version of his The Bingo Long Travelling All-Stars and Motor Kings; Harry Mark Petrakis spoke following the second screening of a film version of his A Dream of Kings.

The entire Writing-in-Chicago program came to an end with a third and final Wild Onion Festival held on 2-3December 1978. The very last session was a panel discussion between Petrakis, Winer, Blakeley and Weinrott, representing respectively, fiction, criticism, poetry and features. Entitled "A Look at Writing in Chicago," the discussion represented a fitting end to a multi-faceted, more than three year examination of its subject.

Appendices II through IV present the various kinds of programs in tabular form with location, dates, and average attendance.

Appendix II- Page 2

No.	Location	Lecturer/Leader	Date	Title	Average Attendance
12.	Lake View	Michael Kathman	Jan. 22-March 12, 1977	Chicago, the City of Architecture	10
13.	Edgewater	Kenan Heise	Jan. 22-March 12	History of Chicago Journalism	32
14.	West Belmont	Michael Kathman	Jan. 22-March 12	The Spirit of Chicago	5
15.	Scottsdale	Harry Mark Petrakis	Feb. 7-Feb. 21	Exploring the Writer's World	47
16.	Cultural Center	Michael Kathman	March 4-May 9	Chicago, the City of Architecture	6
17.	Northtown	Michael Kathman	March 16-May 11	Growing Up and Working in Chicago	16
18.	Edgebrook	Michael Kathman	March 16-May 11	Growing Up and Working in Chicago	3
19.	Rogers Park	Kenan Heise	March 19-May 14	History of Chicago Journalism	20
20.	Edgewater		April 16-May 21	Looking at Writing in Chicago	60
21.	South Chicago	Michael Kathman	June 3-June 15	Growing Up and Working in Chicago	4
22.	Cultural Center	Michael Kathman	June 6-July 11	Growing Up and Working in Chicago	6
23.	Roden	Michael Kathman	June 6-July 11	Chicago, the City of Architecture	22

Appendix II- Page 3

No.	Location	Lecturer/Leader	Date	Title	Average Attendance
24.	Edgewater	Bernard F. Rodgers, Jr.	June 11-July 30, 1977	Contemporaries I	63
25.	Lake View	Gary Cummings	Sept. 20-Nov. 1	The Electonic Age: The Growth of Broadcast Journalism	7
26.	Northtown	Bernard F. Rodgers, Jr.	Sept. 21-Nov. 2	Contemporaries II	32
27.	New City	Barbara Schaaf	Sept. 21-Nov. 2	Chicago, the Melting Pot Continues to Bubble	8
28.	Toman	Harry Mark Petrakis	Oct. 1-Oct. 15	Exploring the Writer's World	13
29.	Mt. Greenwood	Harry Mark Petrakis	Nov. 5-Nov. 19	Exploring the Writer's World	18
30.	Cultural Center	Gary Cummings	Nov. 7-Dec. 19	The Electronic Age: The Growth of Broadcast Journalism	12
31.	Lincoln Park	Bernard F. Rodgers, Jr.	Nov. 9-Dec. 28	Contemporaries III	19
32.	Edgewater	Barbara Schaaf	Nov. 12-Dec. 31	Chicago, the Melting Pot Continues to Bubble	28
33.	South Shore	Harry Mark Petrakis	Dec. 3-Dec. 17	Exploring the Writer's World	24
34.	Cultural Center	Linda Winer	Feb. 23-Apr. 13, 1978	Chicago Becomes a Theater Center	48
35.	Edgewater	Linda Winer	Apr. 20-June 8	Chicago Becomes a Theater Center	23

Appendix II- Page 4

No.	Location	Lecturer/Leader	Date	Title	Average Attendance
36.	Cultural Center	Bernard F. Rodgers, Jr.	Sept. 11- Oct. 30, 1978	The Renaissance in Retrospect: 1890-1930	22
37.	Edgewater	Milton Rakove	Sept. 16- Nov. 4	Politics - Chicago Style	52
38.	Cultural Center	Milton Rakove	Nov. 9- Dec. 28	Politics - Chicago Style	52
39.	Bernard F. Rodgers, Jr.		Nov. 11- Dec. 30	Since the Renaissance: Writing in Chicago, 1930-1978	

Appendix III

The Writing-in-Chicago Program

Writing Workshops

No.	Location	Person	Subject	Date	Attendance
1.	Lincoln Park	Harry Mark Petrakis	Fiction	Sept. 18-Nov. 6, 1976	34
2.	Portage-Cragin	Harry Mark Petrakis	Fiction	Sept. 18-Nov. 6	17
3.	Woodson	Henry Blakely	Poetry	Jan. 18-March 8, 1977	9
4.	King	Harry Mark Petrakis	Fiction	Jan. 22-Feb. 26	13
5.	Cultural Center	Harry Mark Petrakis	Fiction	Jan. 22-Feb. 26	17
6.	Cultural Center	Harry Mark Petrakis	Advanced Fiction	March 3-March 24	16
7.	Cultural Center	Harry Mark Petrakis	Advanced Fiction	March 5-April 2	9
8.	Roden	Harry Mark Petrakis	Advanced Fiction	March 5-April 2	15
9.	Whitney M. Young	Henry Blakely	Poetry	March 15-May 10	9
10.	Cultural Center	Harry Mark Petrakis	Fiction	May 7-June 4	21
11.	Chicago Lawn	Harry Mark Petrakis	Fiction	May 7-June 4	15
12.	Cultural Center	Harry Mark Petrakis	Advanced Fiction	June 2-July 28	16
13.	Cultural Center	Harry Mark Petrakis	Advanced Fiction	June 11-July 30	36
14.	Rogers Park	Harry Mark Petrakis	Fiction	Sept. 24-Oct. 29	31
15.	Cultural Center	Harry Mark Petrakis	Advanced Fiction	Sept. 22-Oct. 27	16
16.	Cultural Center	Harry Mark Petrakis	Advanced Fiction	Nov. 3-Dec. 15	24
17.	Scottsdale	Harry Mark Petrakis	Advanced Fiction	Nov. 5-Dec. 17	22
18.	Cultural Center	Harry Mark Petrakis	Advanced Fiction	Feb. 21-April 4, 1978	23
19.	King	Henry Blakely	Poetry	Feb. 21-April 11	10
20.	Cultural Center	Harry Mark Petrakis	Fiction	Feb. 25-April 8	21
21.	Austin	Henry Blakely	Poetry	April 19-June 7	23
22.	Cultural Center	Harry Mark Petrakis	Fiction	April 22-June 3 (a.m.)	19
23.	Cultural Center	Harry Mark Petrakis	Fiction	April 22-June 3 (p.m.)	13

Appendix III- Page 2

No.	Location	Person	Subject	Date	Attendance
24.	Cultural Center	Harry Mark Petrakis	Fiction	June 13-July 18, 1978	21
25.	Cultural Center	Harry Mark Petrakis	Fiction	June 17-July 15	19
26.	Lake View	Alan Gross	Drama	June 21-Aug. 9	18
27.	Cultural Center	Lester A. Weinrott	Features	June 22-Aug. 10	25
28.	Cultural Center	Lester A. Weinrott	Features	Sept. 12-Oct. 31	17
29.	Woodson	Leon Forrest	Fiction	Sept. 13-Nov. 1	11
30.	Lincoln Park	William Brashler	Prose in General	Sept. 14-Nov. 2	89
31	Cultural Center	Linda Winer	Theater Criticism	Sept. 16-Nov. 4	17
32.	Cultural Center	Harry Mark Petrakis	Fiction	Oct. 28-Dec. 2 (a.m.)	28
33.	Cultural Center	Harry Mark Petrakis	Fiction	Oct. 28-Dec. 2 (p.m.)	28
34.	Rogers Park	Paul Carroll	Poetry	Nov. 8-Dec. 27	

Appendix IV

Writing-in-Chicago

Single Events

No.	Event	Person	Date	Attendance
1.	Tour of Graceland Cemetery	Kenny Jackson Williams	Oct. 4, 1975	150
2.	Labor History and Ethnic Walking Tour	William Adelman	June 19 and Aug. 21, 1976	110
3.	Wild Onion Festival I		Sept. 9-11, 1976	3468
4.	Meet the Author	Harry Mark Petrakis	10 locations Sept.-Dec. 1976	452
5.	The Spirit of Chicago	Michael Kathman	2 locations Dec. 2 and 9, 1976	no figures
6.	Meet the Author	Harry Mark Petrakis	5 locations, Jan. 27-July 7, 1977	248
7	Wild Onion Festival II		Sept. 15-17 1977	3278
8.	Meet the Author	Harry Mark Petrakis	3 evenings, Sept. 24-Oct. 29, 1977	50
9.	Chicago Fiction: From Writer to Reel		4 screenings (each repeated once), Feb. 4-Feb. 25, 1978	1290 (av. 323)
10.	The Chicago Connection		7 screenings (each repeated once), March 2-April 13, 1978	1802 (av. 257)
11.	Exploring the Writer's World (Meet the Author: For Young People)	Harry Mark Petrakis	7 locations, June 6-June 23, 1978	270
12.	Exploring the Writer's World (Illinois Regional Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped)	Harry Mark Petrakis	Nov. 4, 1978	no figures
13.	Wild Onion Festival III		Dec. 2-3, 1978	1131

APPENDIX V QUESTIONNAIRE
THE WRITING IN CHICAGO PROGRAM
A NEH Learning Library Program in The Chicago Public Library
(September - December, 1976)

Growing Up In Chicago
Edgewater Branch Library

EVALUATION BY LEARNER

1. What is your age?

less than 21 years 1
21 years 2
more than 21 years 3

2a. Do you live in Chicago?

yes 1
no 2

(If yes)
b. What neighborhood? _____

(If no)
c. Where do you live outside of Chicago? _____

3. Are you currently enrolled as a .....

	Yes	No
a. full-time student?	1	2
b. part-time student?	2	2

4. Have you ever attended "extension" or "enrichment" courses or series which were not part of a formal degree program?

yes	1	2
no	1	2

5. Which of The Chicago Public Library facilities do you use?

Cultural Center (Michigan and Randolph) 1
Temporary Central Library (425 North Michigan) 2
Branch (specify) 3

_____

6. How frequently do you use any of these facilities?

more than once a week 1
once a week 2
every other week 3
once a month 4
less frequently 5

7. How did you hear about The Writing In Chicago Program?

newspaper advertisement	1
news story	2
radio	3
television	4
posters	5
word of mouth	6
other (specify) _____	

8. Did your participation in this program increase your knowledge of writers (and the contributions of literature)?

yes	1
no	2

9a. Were the presentations clear and understandable?

yes (Skip to Q. 10)	1
no	2

(If no)
b. How could they be improved?

_____

_____

10. Did you enjoy learning in this program?

yes	1
no	2

11a. Did you ask the teacher for individual help in subjects related to the program?

yes	1
no	2

(If yes)
b. Did you get the help you needed? _____

_____

(If no)
c. Why not? _____

_____

12. Did the teacher offer to assist you on an individual basis in your studies?

yes 1
no 2

13a. Did you want to receive college credit for the course?

yes 1
no (Skip to Q. 14 2

(If yes)
b. Have you applied for it?

yes 1
no 2

c. Have y ou received it?

yes 1
no 2

14. For how many weeks would you prefer a Program course scheduled?

eight (8) weeks 1
sixteen (16)weeks 2

15. What have you found to be the most satisfying aspect of The Writing [illegible] far? (use back of page if more space needed)

_____

_____

16. What have you found to be the least satisfying aspect of the Program so far? (use back of page if more space needed)

_____

_____

17. Would you plan to attend future sequences?

yes 1
no 2

18a. Would you recommend this Program to others?

yes (Skip to Q. 18) 1
no 2

(If no)
b. Why not? _____

19. Is this a Program The Chicago Public Library should offer?

Yes	No
1	2

Explain

_____

_____

20. Do you want programs on...(Circle as many answer codes as apply)

	Yes	No
Creative writing?	1	2
history of Chicago?	1	2
Cultural History of the City?	1	2
History of neighborhoods.	1	2
other (specify) _____		

_____

21. Would you be interested in participating in other kinds of activities related to the Program, such as...(Circle as many answer codes as apply)

	Yes	No
a. Field trips to areas or institutions related to the Program?	1	2
b. Discussions about films?	1	2
c. Other activities? (Specify) _____		
_____	1	2

Thank you!

Appendix VI - Page 1

Interview Guides: Branch Librarians

1. What do you understand by the Writing-in-Chicago Program (nature, purpose)?
2. What connection did you have with it?
3. In what ways was the program valuable to the library? How successful was it? (increasing library use? increasing the "visibility" of the library in the community?)
4. How successful was it from your point of view? (informal feedback from participants?)
5. What difficulties were associated with the program for you? (students, facilities, provision and organization of materials, instructors, administrators of the program)
6. Would you have liked more or fewer sessions of the program in your branch?
7. Do you think the program should be continued? (or one like it -- what kinds of programs? What other programs are like it that you give?)
8. Anything interesting or useful for me to know in evaluating the Writing-in-Chicago Program?

Interview Guides: Administrators

1. What do you understand by the Writing-in-Chicago Program (nature, purpose)?

2. How important to the library was it? Where do you see it in terms of priorities of library services and activities?

3. In what ways was it valuable (increased library use such as circulation or reference, increased library visibility in local communities or in the "City")?

4. Why should such a program be in the library as opposed to a local community, junior, liberal arts college?

5. What is the Program's unique character or value, if any?

6. What are the major problems for the library with the program (staffing, cost, library or community support, organizational difficulties)?

7. Should such a program be continued in some form (what form? what department? what level of personnel?)?

8. Have there been other programs in the library like it -- either on-going or in the past?

9. How are adult education programs coordinated and planned?

10. Anything else that comes to mind that I should know in evaluating the Writing-in-Chicago Program.

Appendix VI- Page 3.

Interview Guides: Teachers

1. What do you see as the nature and purposes of the Writing-in-Chicago Program?

2. Was the program successful in your opinion? What did it contribute that was important or unique?

3. What were major problems for you (library staff, project staff, facilities, students, reading materials, other)?

4. Do you think such programs have a role in the library? Why (why not)?

5. Would you participate again? Why (why not)?

6. How effective was your group (consistency of membership, participation)?

7. What is your attitude to obtaining credit for participation in the program?

8. How do such programs relate to those offered by colleges and universities (why the library for such programs)?

Appendix VII

Interviews and Reports

Administrative Staff - Chicago Public Library

Janet Bean	Director, Cultural Center
G. Patrick Green	Deputy Commissioner, Management Services
Donald J. Sager	Commissioner
Alice Scott	Director of Community Relations and Special Programs of Service
Peggy Sullivan	Assistant Commissioner, Extension Services

Branch and Regional Library Staff - Chicago Public Library

Patricia Gleason	Head, Lincoln Park Branch (formerly at Lakeview Branch)
Dolores M. Kane	Head, Edgewater Branch
Dorothy L. Nast	Head, Roden Branch
Roberta Petz	Chief, Northwest District (formerly at Jefferson Park)
Sandra Weir	Head, Lakeview Branch (formerly at Garfield Ridge and Walker)
Elizabeth M. Woods	Head, Chicago Lawn Branch

Project Staff

Stephen Kochoff

Paul Carroll

Milton Rakove

Written Reports Available from:

William Brashler	Michael D. Kathman	Bernard F. Rodgers, Jr.
John Lark Bryant	Stephen Kochoff	Lester A. Weinrott
Robert A. Ferguson	George E. Kent	

9 October 1978

Mr. W. Boyd Rayward
Professor
Graduate Library School
University of Chicago
1100 East 57th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60637

City of Chicago
Michael A. Bilandic, mayor

Donald H. Sager
Commissioner
The Chicago Public Library
425 North Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60611
312 269-2870

Dear Mr. Rayward:

Attached is a request for a proposal (RFP) to evaluate the Writing In Chicago Program which was funded for a three year period by the National Endowment for the Humanities.

This project involved the retention of a number of writers in residence together with some distinguished major authors who lectured and tutored to a broad section of the community on the subject of creative writing. I have enclosed a portion of the project proposal which will describe the Program in somewhat greater detail.

The Program will be completed as a separately funded project of the Endowment in December of 1978. We are inviting you to submit a proposal to serve as an independent evaluator of this Program. Our primary purpose is to determine the most effective aspects of the Program for incorporation into our general activities for the library system. Your evaluation would also become part of our final report to the National Endowment for the Humanities.

If you should have any questions regarding the project, I would invite you to call Stephen Rechoff, who is currently the Program Director, at (312) 269-2817. I would appreciate a response from you by October 31 indicating whether you are interested in performing this evaluation together with a statement regarding your fees for this evaluation and anticipated expenses. A brief commentary on the methodology you will employ in performing the evaluation would be helpful and, if you elect to involve any persons other than yourself in a professional capacity, we would appreciate their names and a brief summary of their backgrounds. We also need to know the anticipated time you will begin the evaluation and when it will be completed. I should note that we

are anxious to have an evaluation near the beginning of the year so that there will be continuity in our program. We will need three copies of a brief report together with your recommendations.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter. Upon receipt of your proposal we will promptly notify you regarding its acceptance and forward a contract to you.

Sincerely,

Donald J. Sager
Commissioner

DJS:jm

Enclosures

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

EVALUATION OF THE WRITING IN CHICAGO PROGRAM

The consultant to be employed under this proposal will be furnished with all reports, files and documents of The Writing In Chicago Program and he/she will be granted the opportunity to confer with all individuals who have been associated with the Program since its inception. A brief written report will be required at the conclusion of the review from the consultant covering the following points:

1. The consultant should review the Program in terms of the goals and objectives contained in the original proposal in order to determine if they have been fulfilled.

2. The consultant should review the documents concerning the programs which have been offered to determine whether these activities related to the Program proposal and its goals and objectives.

3. The consultant will be asked to independently access the attitudes and points of view of selected learners involved in the Program's activities. The Chicago Public Library will furnish the consultant with a list of these individuals from which the consultant may randomly select a representative sampling.

4. The consultant will be asked to independently access the relative satisfaction of major groups whose cooperation was necessary for the Program's implementation. The Chicago Public Library will furnish a list of not more than six organizations that participated in this Program.

5. The consultant will be asked to evaluate the nature of the Program's publicity.

6. The consultant will be required to review the Wild Onion Festival I, II and III to determine their relevance to the Program.

7. The consultant will be asked to determine the Program's contribution relative to the general goals and objectives of The Chicago Public Library/Chicago Library System.

8. If the consultant recommends that the Program should be continued through employing the Library's general funds, recommendation will be required pertaining to where that Program should be placed in the Library's present organizational chart.

9. If the consultant concludes that the Program should not be continued in its present form, he/she should recommend those components of the Program which should be continued.

10. The consultant shall evaluate The Writing In Chicago Program in its totality from its inception in April of 1975 to its conclusion in December of 1978.

11. The final product of the evaluation shall be a brief written report in three copies which will become the property of The Chicago Public Library and which in turn will form part of the Library's final report to the National Endowment for the Humanities which funded The Writing In Chicago Program. In addition, the consultant will be asked to make two oral presentations of his/her evaluation, one before the administrative staff and one before the Library's Board of Directors.

The consultant should, in submitting his/her proposal, include the fee to be charged for the evaluation, an estimate of his/her anticipated and reasonable expenses for which reimbursement will be sought, the estimated time the evaluation will begin, the date at which the evaluation will be completed and the date the final report will be submitted.

For additional information on The Writing In Chicago Program:

Stephen Kochoff
Director
The Writing In Chicago Program
The Chicago Public Library
425 North Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60611
(312) 269-2817

Individual proposal should be sent to:

Donald J. Sager
Commissioner
The Chicago Public Library
425 North Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60611
(312) 269-2070

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
GRADUATE LIBRARY SCHOOL
1100 EAST 57TH STREET
CHICAGO · ILLINOIS 60637

October 31, 1978

Commissioner Donald Sager
Chicago Public Library
425 N. Michigan Ave.
Chicago, IL 60611

Dear Commissioner Sager:

I enclose a Proposal to Evaluate the Writing in Chicago Program based on the RFP that you were kind enough to send me. This makes quite clear, at least by implication, that you are not asking for a properly, or, at least, extensively "scientific" evaluation of a kind that might address such questions as: how did the program affect library use? What were the program benefits to the library, to the participants, to the community? What alternative ways of spending the moneys involved in the program might have been preferable? Rather, I understand the problem to be this: given the existence of a special program specially financed, can we find out, under limited circumstances and in some reasonably objective way, something about its nature and impact that will allow us to answer such questions as: how well did the program seem to function in general? What have those involved in it to say about it? Does it seem an appropriate kind of thing to have in a public library? In these circumstances, a disinterested, systematic approach to the collection and interpretation of the subjective impressions and accounts (spoken and written) of others is considered sufficient.

I also understand that the evaluator's report will become part of the library's report to N.E.H. Thus, though it is the property (quite properly, of course, as work for hire) of the library, it will become a public document. Under these circumstances, I take it that, should you award the contract to me, I will have the right to refer to it and to the information it contains freely? Moreover, I assume that it will go to the N.E.H. with my name attached? My concern is that its

content and format might be changed or chopped about without my knowledge or my consent, while attribution is still made to me.

As you see, I have suggested that the project staff analyze (or rather tabulate, more simply) the existing questionnaire data. This will be mechanical and time-consuming and might be expected to add considerably to the cost of the evaluation if the evaluator had to arrange for it to be done independently.

I would like also to acknowledge that I have been a consultant with the NEH Learning Libraries and Museum Program for the last two years, but I was not in any way connected with the Writing in Chicago program, other than as a Chicago resident who attended one or two large public functions in connection with it. This is only to say that I think I have no special "interest" or axe to grind with regard either to it or to the NEH program in general, but I wanted you to be aware formally of these connections.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity of responding to your RFP. I hope that you will find in mine or other responses to it a proposal that will be useful and effective in its execution.

Yours sincerely,

W. Boyd Rayward
Associate Professor

WBR/dg

Encl.

A PROPOSAL TO EVALUATE THE NEH/CHICAGO PUBLIC LIBRARY'S WRITING IN CHICAGO PROGRAM

Introduction

An evaluation of the Writing in Chicago program would seem to need to be guided by the objectives set forth in the program's proposal documents. Some of the objectives there, however, are not easily examined and some may not be examinable at all. Did the program, for example, increase public knowledge... (objective 1)? Was information disseminated to the entire public library field and to the field of higher education about this new role of public library service (objective 7)?

The RFP to evaluate the program simplifies the difficulties inherent in some of these problems in that it identifies specific groups to be approached and reduces the complexity of the kinds of information to be sought from them.

To fulfill the requirements of the RFP a number of kinds-of data and of documentary information can be assembled and interpreted. The major forms of these are:

a) Program and library documentation. Here, on the one hand, are involved as available the proposals to N.E.H., reports of the program Director, the brochures prepared for each 3-4 monthly segment of the program, printed publicity, and, if it exists, a newspaper and magazine clippings file. Here, on the other hand, are involved the Chicago Public Library/Library System's 5 Year Plan and other materials concerning its goals, objectives, and activities.

b) Interview data derived from major groups of "support" personnel (this expression is used to interpret the RFP point.4) who were responsible for monitoring the program. Here, on the one hand, are the writers and scholars in residence and the program associates. Here, on the other hand, are various members of the Chicago Public Library staff, both those concerned intimately with the program, and others at a supervisory or administrative level involved either with the program or with similar activities in the library.

c) Questionnaire data derived from a sample of program participants.

Methodology

1. It is proposed to evaluate the Writing in Chicago program in part by a careful study of the program's and the library's documentation. This in conjunction with other information will:

a) Provide a full narrative account of the program from its inception to its termination.

b) It will allow identification of program components, the locations in which they were held, and how well the various activities were grouped and systematized into a coherent whole.

c) It will allow some assessment of how successful the program was at a conceptual level in meeting its goals and objectives, and those of the Chicago Public Library/ Library System .

d) It will allow some assessment of the effectiveness of the program's printed publicity, and the extent and nature of media (newspaper and magazine) response to program content and to such events as the various Wild Onion Festivals, certificate awarding ceremonies and so on.

2. Interview data collected according to a fairly open-ended interview schedule for each group will be gathered

a) from writers and scholars in Residence and from all or selected program associates as may be feasible and necessary. These data will bear on what the program meant to them (what they understood its objectives to be), how successful it seemed and in what terms they judge success. The data will allow the identification of

problems relating to content, scheduling, location and facilities, publicity, and administration. One may assume that such key personnel may have useful observations about the role of the program in the library and the value of continuing portions or all of it.

b) The Program Director will be interviewed to determine his special insights and impressions about problems and achievements of the program. He will be able to supply certain factual data ranging from the nature, use and composition of the Advisory Commission, to the number and distribution of TV and radio publicity spots. His input to the evaluative process will largely be concerned with constructing and fleshing out a fairly complete narrative account of the program.

c) Other upper level administrative staff, such as the Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner, Assistant Commissioners and others who may subsequently be identified, will be interviewed to determine what they understand the nature of the program to be and its value to the library. They will be especially useful in assisting the evaluator to identify other library activities or programs, past and present, that are of a comparable nature to the Writing in Chicago Program. This information will be important for deciding, should it be recommended that the whole program (or components of it) be continued by the Library, where in the Library's organization chart these might be located.

4. Questionnaire data from program participants will be analyzed. This exists, the Director of the program has indicated, in the form of presently analyzed questionnaires collected at the end of each program event. Data from these can be tabulated and analyzed to give a profile of participants in particular events in particular locations, and, depending on how the questionnaires were constructed, these data can be aggregated in various ways to give an indication, sufficiently good for the purposes of this kind of evaluation, of the points of view and attitudes of participants (as called for in RFP point 3).

These data should be assembled by the program staff with advice from the investigator, but would need careful interpretation. Such data as are derived in this way are problematic. They do not include

participants not responding to the questionnaire, and some understanding of the meaning of non-response, which it seems implausible to attempt to approach in the context of this evaluation, is generally considered essential in reducing or interpreting bias in such data. Moreover the data will not incorporate the opinions and views of those who were aware of the Writing in Chicago Program but did not choose to participate, or participated briefly and dropped out before the questionnaires were administered.

It may also be difficult to interpret properly certain responses in the available questionnaires—those who enjoy a program, attend it regularly and support the idea of further programs offered free and close to where they live, are likely to exaggerate their use of the public library, for example. To take a sample of participants for further investigation, as suggested in the RFP point 3, seems to this investigator unnecessary given the problems of questionnaire design and administration, and the existence of potentially usable data of this kind already.

From these steps sufficient data should be obtained to allow the investigator to reach some relatively controlled and reasoned impression of how successful the program as a whole has been and whether all or certain portions of it should be continued.

Time Frame

Though the program does not end until December 1978, study of the documentation, program staff analysis of questionnaire data, and interviewing of staff of various kinds could begin at once. The investigator's own schedule would make it likely that a formal report could not be delivered before the end of February, 1979.